Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/empireclubofcana1932unse

Photo by Ashley and Crippen.

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW

PRESIDENT OF THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, 1932.

EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

ADDRESSES DELIVERED TO THE
MEMBERS DURING THE
YEAR 1932

Thirtieth Year of Issue

CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

GOD SAVE THE KING

TORONTO:
PRINTERS GUILD, LIMITED

Copyright, Canada, 1932
The Empire Club of Canada

PRINTED IN CANADA

PRINTERS GUILD, LIMITED
TORONTO, ONT

CONTENTS

PAGE
FRONTISPIECE iii
OFFICERS 1932 vii
ADDRESSES:
THE MANCHURIAN CRISIS 1
THE HON. VINCENT MASSEY.
FEDERAL INDIA 16
DR. W. Y. ELLIOTT.
ONTARIO'S MINING INDUSTRY AND ITS OUTLOOK FOR 1932........ 30
THE HON. CHARLES MCCREA.
THE TRUE INDIA 42
MR. ABDULLAH YUSUF ALI, C.B.E., I.C.S., M.A., ETC.
THE WORLD CRISIS AND THE OUTLOOK 55
RABBI BARNETT R. BRICKNER.
THE FUTURE OF THE LEGITIMATE THEATRE 74
MR. MAURICE COLBOURNE.
MUSSOLINI AND THE NEW ITALY 87
DR. WILLIAM SHERWOOD FOX, B.A., M.A., PH.D., LL.D., F.R.S.C.
HOW SPEED RECORDS ARE BROKEN 103
SIR MALCOLM CAMPBELL.
BUSINESS AND POLITICS 114
COUNT SERGE FLEURY.
GILBERT AND SULLIVAN 121
MR. REGINALD STEWART AND MR. A. MUNRO GRIER, K.C.
THE ART OF LISTENING 137
SIR JOHN ADAMS.
THE INTERPRETERS OF CANADA 153
MR. ARTHUR STRINGER.
THE IMPERIAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE 163
HON. G. HOWARD FERGUSON.
EMPIRE TRADE REQUIRES UNIFORM STANDARDS 174
CHARLES D. LE MAISTRE, C.B.E.

PAGE

THE SCOTTISH TRADE MISSION 188
HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF MONTROSE.

THE OUTLOOK OF EMPIRE 197
SIR GRANVILLE RYRIE, K.C.M.G.

THE RACE FOR THE HARMSWORTH TROPHY 211
MR. KAYE DON.

BEHIND THE SCENES 218
MR. ARTHUR BEVERLEY BAXTER.

THE NEW EMPIRE PARTNERSHIP 232
SIR PERCY HURD, M.P.

CHEMISTRY IN WAR TIME 239
SIR JAMES IRVINE, C.B.E., F.R.S.

THE CHANGING SCENE 250
MR. HECTOR CHARLESWORTH.

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE? 262
SIR NORMAN ANGELL.

TORONTO UNIVERSITY AND THE PUBLIC 274
DR. H. J. CODY, M.A., D.D., LL.D.

BEING PUSHED INTO SOCIALISM 286
MR. B. K. SANDWELL, B.A., F.R.S.C.

FOURTEEN YEARS OF PEACE 296
DR. WILLIAM HAMILTON FYFE, LL.D.

THE CRISIS IN THE FAR EAST 303
SIR FREDERICK WHYTE, K.C.S.I., LL.D.

THE NEW GERMANY 316
COUNT VON LUCKNER AND PROF. VICTOR LANGE, PH.D.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION IN WISCONSIN 332
PROF. HAROLD M. GROVES.

MUSIC IN A DISORDERED WORLD 350
MR. EDWARD JOHNSON.

APPENDIX I. POSTPONEMENT OF ANNUAL MEETING 356
" II. ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT 357
" III. HONORARY MEMBERS AND PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE CLUB 358
" IV. CONSTITUTION AND ORDINANCES OF THE EMPIRE CLUB 360

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE

YEAR 1932

Patron:

FIELD MARSHAL H.R.H., THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT
AND STRATHEARN, K.G., G.C.M.G., ETC.

Honorary President:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RT. HON. EARL OF
BESSBOROUGH, P.C., G.C.M.G.

President: LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW.
First Vice-President: LIEUT.-COLONEL B. O. HOOPER, D.S.O., M.C.
Second Vice-President: MR. GEORGE D. DAVIS.
Third Vice-President: MR. DANA PORTER.
Secretary-Treasurer: MR. E. M. MORRIS.

Executive Committee:

MAJOR W. JAMES BAXTER
MR. J. H. BRACE
PROVOST COSGRAVE
MR. W. J. DARBY
MR. F. B. FETHERSTONHAUGH
MR. H. C. GROUT
MR. GORDON HEWITT
MR. J. P. HYNES
MR. MAIN JOHNSON
MR. NAPIER MOORE
MR. J. W. MCCLAIN
MR. JOHN D. SPENCE
MR. C. V. SYRETT
MR. WM. TYRRELL
MR. W. B. WATSON
MR. HOWARD WEBSTER
MR. J. P. PRATT

Immediate Past President: MR. H. G. STAPELLS

Past Presidents:

MR. F. J. COOMBS
MR. NORMAN SOMMERVILLE
MR. ARTHUR HEWITT

Honorary Auditor: MR. H. T. JAMIESON

THE MANCHURIAN CRISIS

AN ADDRESS BY THE HON. VINCENT MASSEY.

January 14, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, PRESIDENT, introduced the speaker.

HON. MR. MASSEY: Canada needs no argument to show that the situation in Manchuria is one to command her active interest. No disturbance as grave as this, and which affects in its immediate proximity one-third of the population of the world, can very well be isolated. As a matter of fact we have not forgotten the lesson which we learned in 1914 of what an obscure crime in a Balkan state can mean. We are therefore not unmindful of what events may flow from the destruction of a few metres of railway line four months ago at an unknown place in Manchuria—the Balkans of Asia.

We may well be conscious of an added reason for concerning ourselves with this latter question. We belong to an international body whose duty it is to consider just such things, and the Council of the League of Nations represents the board of directors of a corporation of which we are shareholders and for whose actions we have a full share of responsibility. Again, it is for us, with the full obligation of nationhood, to arrive at an independent opinion as to whether the terms of the Treaty of Washington of 1922, which enjoins its signatories, amongst other things, "to respect the sovereignty, the independence and the territorial and administrative integrity of China", have been infringed. We must decide for ourselves, too, whether either party to this present dispute has violated the terms of the Pact of

Paris, which rules that the "settlement or solution of all disputes....shall never be except by pacific means". It is hard to reconcile some recent occurrences with this provision.

Again, our trade with the Orient is now of sufficient volume to make us watch Manchuria with an increasingly anxious eye. I have heard it maintained recently that the Far Eastern crisis is actually assisting us through the goods which China is now ordering from Canada instead of from Japan, with which country she has, for the time being, refused to trade. It is no doubt true that we are enjoying a temporary advantage for this reason, but I think you will agree that for the few thousand dollars' worth of trade which this may temporarily bring us, we are likely to lose tens and scores of thousands in the loss of purchasing power suffered by that very promising customer of ours, Japan, as a result of this same boycott.

The incident of September 18th last, when the Japanese General Staff took it on itself to administer the "sharp lesson", which for some time they had been itching to apply to the Chinese, is, as we know, only one new page in a melancholy chapter of trouble of which Manchuria has been the cause for half a century. This area has come to be one of the world's great friction points—I was going to say one of the world's two great friction points, because there seem to be two regions, one in Europe and one in Asia, which offer a perpetual menace to international peace—the former lying near the eastern frontier of Germany, where the Polish corridor was made to sever German territory. There is an analogy between the two. Leaving the rights and wrongs of the matter to one side, they each of them represent a situation created and maintained by force, where the only answer to force on the part of the weaker party is a bitter and smouldering resentment and a constantly threatening restlessness.

It may be useful to turn from the recent events for a moment and direct our attention to the real Manchurian problem which lies behind them. What arguments does each disputant bring to the issue? Japan's case is impressive. First of all comes the argument of economic necessity. You are familiar with the facts. Japan is faced with the twin problems of growing population and inadequate food supply. The solution can only come from a steady process of industrialization. Manchuria provides what she urgently needs for this purpose—raw materials and markets. Japan, for instance, produces only one-twentieth of the iron ore which she uses. This and the coal on which her industrial life depends, and the fertilizer which is needed for her ancient fields, and fuel oil and even food stuffs must be imported in increasing quantities—and Manchuria supplies them, just as it supplies markets for the great factories of Osaka and Nagoya. It is no wonder that the trade of Japan with Manchuria should have increased in the last twenty years twelve-fold until now, to judge from trade figures, the Manchurian provinces are economically more important to Japan than they are even to China proper. More than half their external trade is with the Japanese Empire.

Then there is the argument of "blood and treasure". You have only to hear a Japanese speak of the seige of Port Arthur, although it is now nearly a generation away, to realize what this means to national pride. What Vimy Ridge meant to the Canadian Corps, Port Arthur meant to Japan. Japan's achievements in Manchuria began with a great adventure which marked her accession to full national stature. Her pride in this is a powerful element in the present crisis. She has paid a vast price in money as well as in men. There is no doubt whatever of the treasure which has been poured into Manchuria. In twenty-five years it is estimated that Japan and the Japanese have invested one thousand million dollars gold in the development of Manchurian industry and agriculture.

The Japanese make much of their legal claims in Manchuria. Elaborate and convincing statements are made as to the documentary grounds on which they base their present policy. The control of the South Manchurian Railway and its subsidiaries and the extension of its lease and that of Dairen and Port Arthur, the maintenance of Japanese troops and police in Manchuria, Japan's protests against the construction of competing Chinese railways, her exercise of mining rights—all these contentions have a technical legal basis in various conventions and agreements.

Practical people, such as we Canadians are, cannot help being impressed by the argument of efficiency which appeals to us perhaps more strongly than the briefs of international lawyers. Japan's twenty-five years in Manchuria is an engrossing story of business achievement. The railway of which we hear so much may sound like a transportation system and nothing more. (It operates, as a matter of fact, only some 700 miles of line, although with admirable efficiency.) But when we remember its coal and iron mines, shale oil works, gas and electric plants, blast furnaces, research laboratories, geological institutions, hospitals, schools, hotels and even model farms and agricultural experimental stations—all operated by the railway—we can accept it as one of the most striking business enterprises in the world. We can understand why the earnings of the South Manchurian Railway should be greater than all the Chinese lines put together, or how Dairen has now become the second port in China—the greatest next to Shanghai. Japan's aim in all this effort is naturally to benefit Japan, but the Japanese can claim quite rightly that the Chinese share in the resultant blessings. The versatile soya bean, for instance, which Manchuria produces may now feed millions of the Japanese population, but their cultivation means works for other millions of Chinese farmers and a market for their product. Again, Japan can say with justice that the Chinese population of these Manchurian provinces have gained immeasurably by the law and order which she has instituted, and the effort she has put forward in the name of efficient administration.

Perhaps this may seem like the answer to the Manchurian riddle. We may be tempted to say, if a power is willing to bestow economic prosperity in this troubled region why should we inquire too closely into the grounds for its presence or the methods by which its tenure is secured? A dangerous precedent this would be, however, for economics do not tell the whole story. In the last analysis there are other elements in international affairs, sometimes even more powerful. Racial pride is one. I remember a conversation a few weeks ago in China when a Japanese friend was stating the case for Japan in Manchuria, and touched on the victory over Russia in 1905-6. A Chinese said to the Japanese: "your sentimental plea dates back for twenty-five years; ours goes back for three centuries." This was characteristic of the Chinese, who think of centuries as we think of weeks. The Manchu emperors may have been dethroned in China for twenty years, but the Chinese look on Manchuria—the cradle of the dynasty—as essentially theirs. It has been reported that the young gentleman whose former greatness is now masked under the name of Mr. Henry Pu Yi, is now back in the home of his ancestors in Mukden. I had the pleasure of having a talk with the "Young Emperor", as his friends still call the last of the Manchus, at his home in Tientsin, a few weeks ago. Had he been a little longer on the Chinese throne before his abdication it is just possible that his intelligence and honesty of mind might have changed the course of history.

However, that is a digression. To continue with the Chinese case. Whatever we may think about China's sentiment for Manchuria at the present time, we must realize that we are faced, not with a theory, but with a fact. Any one who has been in China in the last few months will agree that the racial feeling evoked by the

Manchurian crisis is strong enough to move Chinese all over that disunited country to face the situation as one man. They are bitter, resentful and determined that they will not submit to the violation of what they regard as their sovereignty.

Apart from the presence in these three Eastern provinces of China—as the Chinese prefer to call Manchuria—of thousands of Japanese troops, it is difficult for her to be persuaded that Japan has not in mind a fate for this region similar to that which befell Korea which, as you know, is a Japanese dependency. The South Manchurian railway they refuse to regard as a bona fide commercial enterprise. They look on it rather as the entering wedge for the political domination of their Eastern provinces. In this connection the Chinese cannot understand why Japan will not permit the growing population of Korean immigrants in Manchuria to become Chinese citizens, although she permits her subjects to assume alien citizenship in every other country. The Japanese argue that these Koreans in Manchuria too often act as agents for anti-Japanese plots in Korea itself—as they do. But this leaves the Chinese unmoved.

China steadfastly maintains that Manchuria is Chinese. Of its population of some thirty millions, all but two or three millions have come from China, less than a million from Korea and only some 200,000 from Japan itself. The gross immigration from neighbouring Chinese provinces to Manchuria in the last few years has been over one million per annum. This represents, as a matter of fact, the greatest migratory movement in modern history, and there is still room for plenty of settlers, for it is estimated that Manchuria can support over twice her present population.

Japan claims that just as twenty-five years ago she checked the expansion of imperialistic Russia, she now provides the eastern barrier to the ambitions of the Soviets. But the Chinese say in answer to this claim that the most imminent danger from Russia is not Russian bayonets but bolshevistic ideas. The present aim of

Russia is not the acquisition of Chinese territory through any overt act, but rather the conquest of Chinese minds through propaganda. Chinese have told me that during these weeks of disillusionment through which the nationally-conscious Chinese are passing, the temptation to turn to Bolshevism, despite the efforts of the Government on the other side, is becoming almost irresistible. Bolshevism, it must be remembered, is a disease which feeds on misery and despair. The danger of Moscow being involved in the present crisis in a military sense, is, I would suggest, extremely remote, and it is unlikely that the individualistic Chinese would ever accept communistic principles, but Bolshevism in its destructive sense may still find strong outposts in China to serve as a new threat to the world outside. There is every reason to believe that Moscow is entirely satisfied with the course of events in Manchuria.

The Chinese answer to the legal claims of the Japanese has been made plain enough in the last few weeks. China, as I have said, denies their validity. Japan may base the extension of her leases on a treaty signed by China; they may offer the same grounds for many privileges such as the right of their nationals to lease land and engage in agriculture, the right of maintaining consular police and exercising consular jurisdiction over Japanese subjects in the interior, but the agreements in question, the Chinese point out, were presented, as the world of course knows they were, in the form of an ultimatum in 1915 and signed under pressure. For this reason, China repudiates them as having no moral sanction and celebrates the anniversary of their signature as a day of national humiliation.

So much for the major arguments on both sides. It is not a case of right against wrong—whichever side you take—but rather right against right—a conflict of different kinds of right conceived by different kinds of mind. In every dispute, of course, there are factors often overlooked, which have their own significance. One element in the Manchurian problem has recently been discussed by a distinguished Japanese, who criticizes the policy of the South Manchurian Railway, with great frankness. He disapproves, for instance, of its unwillingness to employ Chinese, apart from rare instances, except in manual labour. He criticizes such petty and irritating practices as that of changing Chinese street names in Manchurian towns to Japanese, and deplores the actual discrimination of the railway authorities under certain conditions against Chinese passengers, and their refusal to carry Chinese troops in the movement against Russia two years ago. These things may sound trivial, but they have their own bearing on the problem. Human nature being as it is, such discrimination against the Chinese on what they regard as their own soil, probably chafes more harshly on the individuals even than the presence of foreign police or consular courts—irritating although these are.

It cannot, of course, be said that China's answer to this has taken the most helpful form. The Chinese side of the case has too often been in the hands of irresponsible and lawless people and, as we know, Japan has been subject to an exasperating policy of pin-pricks from which both personal safety and the rights of property have seriously suffered. Banditry and sabotage in Manchuria have long been a curse. When one considers, however, that the Nationalist Government established itself at Nanking and commenced its task of governing 400 million people (a population as big as that of Europe), only three years ago, it is not to be wondered at that outlying provinces should still suffer from disorders.

The Manchurian problem, of course, bristles with difficulties. The very railway map of Manchuria seems to give a depressing enough picture of conflicting national aims, with Chinese railways, Japanese railways, Sino-Japanese railways and Sino-Russian railways, all in desperate competition. The map itself, however, suggests two facts to brighten the scene. First, none of the national units represented desires war—that is of the first magnitude. The finances of none could stand the strain. As for Russia, she is far too occupied with her great plan of industrialization to risk it on such an adventure, and the best judgment of both Japan and China, I am convinced, is against such a measure. Secondly, these politically-minded railways are all needed for an economic job. Manchuria is rich enough and big enough to carry them all in a co-ordinated plan which should be possible to achieve when the emotional clouds have lifted.

But these clouds have not yet lifted. Chinese official policy has been largely negative—to offer no resistance and to appeal to the League quite properly under an article which exists for just such a purpose. But the national boycott against Japan (for which the government has no responsibility) represents, so I was informed, the most widespread and vindictive use of this familiar Chinese weapon within the memory of living residents. The boycott committees are well organized, intimidation against those who break the rules is freely practised and while I was in Shanghai several merchants who had offended the boycott committee were kidnapped and placed in the precincts of a temple. In this building, inappropriately known as the "Temple of the Goddess of Heaven", they languished for many days.

The depth of feeling is patent to any visitor. The face of China seems covered with posters, either printed or improvised locally, depicting the sins of the Japanese in Manchuria in the most sanguinary form. It seemed to me as if few spaces on the walls of buildings or on railway trains were left untouched by some such evidence of national ardour. Bands of students would invade railway carriages to enlist the aid of Chinese and the sympathy of the foreigner alike in the national cause. On the steps of Sun Yat Sen's tomb in Nanking we saw written in blood the pledges of students to avenge the wrongs of China. Educationists told us that the student body, always an intemperate element in the Chinese population, had never been so moved as now. We saw them parading in their thousands for the purpose of demanding war. One Chinese college head, with infinite wisdom, said that when the strong wine of nationalism had so mounted to the heads of his students that they wished to move straight off to fight Japan, he suggested three or four hours of hard drill a day by way of preparation. This he found had a sobering effect. But unfortunately, there seems to be little to check the rising fury of the student world of China and the increasingly large urban population which shares their excitement. There is every reason to believe that the Chinese Government is doing all in its power to urge moderation and restraint. When some of us visited the President, General Chiang Kai-shek, in Nanking, there were several Japanese members in our party. These, in addition to the heavy military protection which their presence made necessary, were treated with every consideration. Offending posters were removed before their arrival, and the President himself went out of his way to treat them with especial courtesy. The President too has made several courageous efforts to moderate the popular feeling.

What am I to say of the status quo of Manchuria at present? For the moment there appears to be quiet in the Manchurian theatre—a quiet which has followed the march of Japanese troops. Japan is now in complete control of all three Manchurian provinces. This she has accomplished by the application of the ancient method of force. And whatever the provocation may have been, and we can agree that it was considerable, she cannot escape the charge of having violated solemn international engagements in doing what she has done.

Questions of first importance are suggested by the relations between the League of Nations and the Government of Japan in the Manchurian issue. It may clarify our thinking if we consider for a moment the various approaches which the League has in its power to make to an international situation. These are, roughly, three in number. First, the League itself can apply force. Under the provisions of Article 16 of the Covenant, as everyone knows, a recalcitrant power can be placed under economic pressure from its fellow members. Such a course in the present instance would, in my opinion, be unwise and unsound. The League is not a super-state; it does not exist to function as a piece of coercive machinery. It can exist only as a voluntary association of sovereign states. If its authority even to investigate an international question submitted to its Council is challenged, as Japan has challenged it recently, it does not require much political imagination to realize the threat to its solidarity which would follow the exercise of economic sanctions. There is little use in attempting a course of action against a member state which might well lead to its withdrawal from this voluntary association. There is, therefore, a practical reason against such a course of action, quite apart from the belief of most of us that force in international affairs has rarely solved anything. It has usually only created a new set of difficulties.

In the machinery of the League are two other methods of dealing with such a situation as we have in Manchuria. One of these, arbitration, we could dismiss at present as impossible. There are too many elements on both sides which the disputants would regard as political—matters not justiciable and not to be submitted to a court. The preparation of the terms of reference would be as difficult as the settlement of the dispute itself.

There is a third approach open to the League which, in the present issue, the Council has endeavoured to pursue—the process of conciliation. It has, of course, become fashionable to regard the League in this episode as a rather futile and well-intentioned body which has spent four laborious months in the painful and widely advertised accomplishment of nothing at all. This view, I would suggest, is not fair. I think it is clear that in the first six weeks of the issue at least, the League operated as a check on both sides in the Manchurian theatre. On the other hand, an attitude of extreme eulogy with reference to the League is, in any circumstances, just as unwise as that of unthinking criticism. One cannot, of course, ever accept the League's actions as infallible simply because it stands for a noble ideal. Idealism and mistaken judgment are, unfortunately, now and then seen in company.

The League has made, I would suggest, one serious error in the present crisis, in demanding last October the withdrawal of Japanese troops by a given date. This order undoubtedly consolidated Japanese opinion behind the war party, and is probably partly responsible for the replacement, a few weeks ago, of the late government by one of less moderate policy. When an order such as the one delivered to Japan can be supported with force, there is less need to be careful not to cause offence to the nation involved. Its assent, in such a case, is not required. Even the process of arbitration carries legal sanctions, but conciliation and arbitration are two different things. Conciliation involves no sanctions of any kind and is successful only if the good will and co-operation of both parties is secured. In the case in point between the League and Japan, this principle does not seem to have been observed. It would seem to be a matter of common sense that when you are attempting to arrive at a settlement with any person, or any group of persons, that you should endeavour to cause as little embarrassment to the other party as possible and that you should do what you can to save him from the humiliating position of "losing face". This involves an intelligent endeavour to appreciate and understand his point of view and also an intimate contact with the "atmosphere" of the situation involved and also the avoidance of publicity during the conversations. (The process of conciliation is not greatly helped by conversation through a megaphone.) These factors in the case in point seem to have been disregarded.

Much of the difficulty was due to the distance involved. I have already ventured the suggestion that had the Council of the League, or a committee of its members of cabinet rank, paid the eastern powers the compliment of holding their meetings on this all-important issue in Tokyo and Nanking and Mukden, there might have been a better chance of arriving at a sound judgment and of carrying the confidence of the governments involved.

(Applause). Geneva and Paris are, after all, some eight thousand miles away from these Oriental communities, and when an exchange of views on highly delicate subjects is effected through cables which must be put into cypher and then decoded and translated and passed through half a dozen hands, one is apt to have left nothing but the bare, uncomprising facts. Personal touch and a knowledge of the atmosphere which cannot be transmitted by mechanical means, are, in such cases, essential to success.

There are plenty of liberal-minded Japanese—I had the pleasure of meeting a good many of them both in Shanghai and Tokyo—whose attitude to the League is enlightened and co-operative, but, unfortunately, as the weeks passed and the Council of the League seemed to the Japanese peoeple both remote and unsympathetic, Japan seemed to fall more and more under the influence of the military party, who are pleased to regard the League of Nations as an unlicensed intruder. And, under its new government, Japan has revealed a definite resentment of outside interference in the Manchurian issue as being a private quarrel. But no international dispute can any longer be a private quarrel, and there surely should be no question of the propriety of the League's investigation of any international situation of sufficient gravity to be referred to it under one of the articles of the Covenant. The fact that on this occasion one of the disputants apparently resents its good offices as an intrusion only serves to show that the ideals of the League are still in advance of the claims of nationalism. In Manchuria today we have something more significant than a conflict between the Chinese people and the Japanese government. We have a collision between twentieth century international machinery and a nineteenth century point of view. The world has accepted, in theory at least, certain principles for the settlement of international disputes and we no longer live in a prewar era in which there was nothing to check national action but the opposing self-interest of rivals. It is no doubt a source of irritation to the Japanese general staff to have it said that their action in Manchuria is not a domestic matter but one of concern to the society of nations as a whole. It is, nevertheless, of vital importance that in the settlement of the present issue, that principle should be stoutly upheld.

May I suggest that, however ineffective it may have been in this controversy, we must not lose faith in the League. Our course should be rather to give it to the utmost our intelligent support. For the Council, as a committee of governments, can be no stronger than public opinion among the peoples which those governments represent. It is too early yet to judge the League. Statesmanship at Geneva can still assert itself. The test will come with the report of the commission which is shortly to assemble and with what measure of acceptance that report can receive. The *status quo* in Manchuria at the moment has been won by the sword. If the principles for which the League stands are to be vindicated, this *status quo* must either be justified or modified in accordance with reason and justice.

It is greatly to be hoped that the League's commission will be satisfied with no superficial approach to existing difficulties. Whether it is within their terms of reference or not, the world requires a complete liquidation of the Manchurian situation and basic reconstruction of relationships with the essentials safeguarded on both sides. It should not be an insoluble problem to ascertain what those essentials are. Both sides must, of course, make concessions. Wise opinion in Japan has no thought of Manchuria except in terms of economics; Japanese investments must be adequately protected. Wise opinion in China has no wish that these should be jeopardized, and desires only that Chinese sovereign rights shall not be infringed. The two pillars of any permanent settlement must therefore be the protection of Japanese commercial enterprise, on the one hand, and the safe-guarding of China's sovereignty on the other.

No problem is insoluble, but problems can easily be given a wrong solution. Whatever is done in Manchuria can only have a lasting effect if it is done with the free and uncoerced assent of both parties. This need not be urged on idealistic grounds alone. There is a moral side to such a question, of course, but I submit that it is also very practical common sense. A peace which is readily accepted is more likely to be kept. Let us hope that who ever the man may be who must ultimately deal with the Manchurian question they will make a job of it. The world, Canada as part of it, will stand to profit greatly from such an achievement. (Hear, hear, and loud and continued applause).

The President expressed the hearty thanks of the Club to the speaker for his able exposition of a difficult subject, on which he had spoken from personal observation of the problems on the spot.

FEDERAL INDIA

An Address by DR. W. Y. ELLIOTT, Head of Department of Government at Harvard University.

Thursday, January 21, 1932

Lieut.-Colonel George A. Drew, President, introduced the speaker.

Dr. Elliott: To Canadians and Americans, and to the entire world, India's faith is a thing that ought to be approached seriously. Thank heaven, there are no prohibitory barriers to the exchange of ideas, at least, between our two countries. (Hear, hear). I come to you as a sympathizer with the British Empire in the plight in which the Mother Country of the great group of nations is at present involved. I profess to come to you as one who wishes well to the Empire, but who is trying to analyze this trouble as dispassionately as may be, and look at the long-range possibilities, because it seems to me that is the truest friendship to Britain in dealing with India. To an audience like this, which has made a thorough study of it through distinguished speakers, some of whom I know, it is not necessary to recapitulate the facts, formidable as they are, of that sub-continent with its diversity of religions and peoples, and so on. So we can plunge at once *in medias res.*

The reforms have definitely reached a point at which the British Raj in India is committed to the effort of uniting India in some such federal form as has been imposed on two or three of the greatest of the British Dominions; and that effort may well prove to be the most crucial test that has ever been made of the power of the Empire to hold an eastern people. For the present moment the execution of that effort seems to be prejudiced by the events in India in the past two months, beginning before the arrest of Mr. Gandhi and his incarceration in Poona jail, which he knows very well from past experience, to which he retires from time to time, as I suggest, with a real feeling of relief. (Laughter.)

I do not think that the most recent and painful events in India can be treated as having ended the experiment in federalism, though they may delay it. Federation represents constitutionally a climax, because it represents, the effort of Indian opinion to grapple with this most fundamental of its problems—how it can impose any unity whatever on so diverse a people. According to the last census there are almost eighty million Moslems, of whom it is fair to say that the vast majority are totally unwilling to be merged into Nationalist India. There are at least sixty million "untouchables"; there are many other communities such as Sikhs, Parsees, Anglo-Indians and finally the Europeans, the latter community small in numer but tremendously important, because they represent Britain's stake in India.

Britain is not in a position to resign that stake without inviting her economic dissolution. At a modest estimate at least a billion pounds of capital is controlled by Great Britain, if not directly owned. India is the largest of all her markets, representing normally eleven per cent of her total export trade. The British share has fallen (through the boycott of the last years) from about fifty per cent of India's total imports to a third or less; nevertheless the Indian market is a vital factor in Britain's economic life.

Now, will Britain be able to placate those elements which derive from Nationalist capitalism, from mill-owners in Bombay and other parts, the Bombay Brokers' Association, and Indian Chambers of Commerce, the backbone of the financial support which has supported Mr. Gandhi's movement—the India National Congress Movement—and kept it going at the pace it has? Can England placate those forces, and at the same time keep the reserve powers on which she insists in order to protect her enormous economic stake there?

What are those reserve powers? You in Canada know something of reservations made by Lord Durham, who in his classic report made the assertion that responsible government in the Colonies, as they then were, could be reconciled with reserve powers which left to England the control of finance, external relations, tariffs, the army, foreign affairs, and in his case, Crown lands. He had then in Canada a minority problem, but not similar in complexity to that in India.

The slow evolution of Canada to Dominion Status, with all that phrase implies to-day, stripped away those reserved powers. But they did not disappear until Canada had shown the capacity to assume these heavy responsibilities. The path of the reforms in India leads slowly in the same direction. But the government in England does not propose to be stamped out of India, at once.

The New Year opened in India, as in many other parts of the world, with omens unfavourable to peace. Where the First Round Table Conference in London, which ended at the beginning of last year, left hopes of a truce that might be prolonged into a settlement along constitutional lines, the Second Conference closed with the practical certainty that the struggle in India would shortly be begun again, and with no hopes of quarter being given or asked by either side. The first days of the year confirmed the worst auguries.

On January fourth, just a month after he left English shores, Mahatma Gandhi was arrested. He was seized, as he expected to be, in the early morning hours of the day which followed the Viceroy's refusal of the interview which Mr. Gandhi had demanded. His recommitment to the old military stronghold of Yerovda at Poona followed by a few days the arrest of Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru and Abdul Gaffer Khan. These steps inaugurated a series of swift and vigorous measures by the Government of India and the Provincial Governments to crush completely the All-India National Congress Movement by arresting its leaders, attaching its funds, and by attempting to prevent all publication of its documents or contributions to its treasury.

Bengal had already been brought under what was tantamount to a state of siege; and in the Northwest Frontier some casualties and numerous arrests had been inflicted upon the Gaffer Khan's "Red Shirts"—a fanatical sect of Nationalist Moslems.

The Viceroy, Lord Willingdon, the former Governor-General of Canada, backed by a Tory Government that holds Mr. MacDonald and a few Liberals as hostages, thus seems at first sight completely to have reversed the conciliatory policy of the preceding Viceroy, Lord Irwin. Though Lord Willingdon professes only to be clearing the way of obstruction in order to allow the work of the constitution-makers to be resumed in India, it is clear that his determination is fixed to sweep away the extremists at all costs. The recent wave of political murders in India and the announcement by the National Congress Party that it intended immediately to resume "non-violent" civil disobedience unless the so-called "repressive" Bengal ordinance were revoked made the Viceroy's attitude almost certain in advance. It was on this ground that he refused an interview with Mr. Gandhi.

Mahatma Gandhi was himself arrested under a Bombay Ordinance of 1827 which permits the government to place "under personal restraint" without a trial any person whose detention is thought necessary to prevent "internal commotion". Some surprize has been expressed in the press at the use of this antique law, which seems to have doubtful legality and to have been aimed mainly at the subjects of other sovereigns. But the Government of India, though it saw fit to produce a law venerable with over a hundred years' existence, had other measures at its disposal, and an unlimited capacity to invoke the "emergency" ordinance-making power of the Viceroy to supplement the legal weapons already at hand.

The arrest of Mr. Gandhi was immediately followed by the promulgation of four severely restrictive ordinances forbidding even peaceful picketing or the staging of "mock-funerals" of individuals whom the Congress Party hopes to intimidate by this prophetic threat of "dummy burial". In addition the powers of the Government were extended by outlawing the "All-India National Congress Party" in every possible way, including a ban on contributions to its funds. Severe penalties might be imposed even on children. By these measures, and by the swift arrest of each successively named President of the Congress after Mr. V. Patel, Dr. Prasad, and Mr. Ansari, the Government hopes to control the boycott movement against British goods, and to deprive the Congress of its leaders and its funds. A clear test of strength of the methods of "Non-cooperation" when faced by a ruthless and determined Government may therefore be expected.

The Nationalists profess to have been prepared for this turn of events, and they point out that a similar campaign was tried by Lord Irwin after Mr. Gandhi's arrest in May, 1930, following his inauguration of a war on payment of salt-taxes and rent by the peasants. But there are several significant differences in technique in this effort to curb non-cooperation. Lord Willingdon has not hesitated to outlaw the whole Congress Party, and to attach its funds. He has made it a penal offence to contribute. This is a circumstance that may aid in giving the mill-owners and the Indian capitalists a plausible excuse for withdrawing their support from a movement that was proving expensive to subsidize, and which might at any time blow up a wind of anarchy like that under which China has been blasted. The success of the boycott depends upon the retention of non-violent methods, and this in turn depends upon the liberal use of funds for publicity and propaganda. Offices have been raided and locked, leaders arrested all over India. The Provincial governments have acted with decision, and the Central Government itself devoted its attention especially to Bombay, Calcutta, New Delhi, and Ajmer in the Rajputana, as well as the whole Madras Presidency—the hotbeds of sedition.

The manner of arrest and the treatment of prisoners differs notably from that of the previous round-ups. Where before the Provincial Governments waited for an actual incitation to non-payment of taxes, or at least permitted the Congress leaders a few days in office, now the arrests are wholesale and obviously very carefully planned. The arrest of the successive Congress Presidents has proceeded with lightning rapidity, after each was named. Mr. Wallabhai J. Patel, who followed Gandhi into prison, was followed immediately by Mr. R. Prasad, who was in turn followed by Dr. Ansari. All three were in prison in twenty-four hours. Mrs. Gandhi and other women leaders have also been arrested.

Furthermore, the Government appears to have done with mere detention of the most persistent and violent of their opponents: Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is doing two years' time at hard labor, and Mr. Subhas Bose, former mayor of Calcutta, seems about to follow his example. The death penalty may be inflicted for violation of the ordinance already announced, and sentence may be passed in the absence of the defendant by recording only the substance of the evidence.

The usual hartals, or strikes, have been declared. The Bombay Brokers' Association has declared a boycott, and the boycott is operating. But there has been comparatively little really serious rioting as yet. Those riots that have occurred have been summarily suppressed by the police, who fired in several cases early enough to indicate that mobs will probably not continue to stone with impunity in the future.

These measures are harsh, and they are intended to be. They indicate that the British Government and the present Viceroy in India both believe that the time has come to try to stamp out Congress' opposition.It was morally certain after Mr. Gandhi left England, even if he did not give out the alleged interview predicting the coming storm to the *Giornale d'Italia* in Rome, that the extremer elements in the Congress Party could no longer be held in leash, as he had managed to do at Karachi after his truce with Lord Irwin nearly a year ago. The three Committees of the Conference which are to re-convene in India late this month faced the certainty of boycott and intimidation. Twelve murders of officials and many other attempts during the year indicated a dangerous state of the public mind. Baghat Singh, accused of one of the earlier murders, was made almost a national hero by the Congress Party. The disquieting fact that women and girls, long very effective in the boycott and picketing movements, had begun to try their hands at assassination, could not but make British nerves jumpy.

What fundamental causes have produced this apparent change of attitude on the part of the British *Raj* in India, from the conciliation of Lord Irwin to the sternest measures of repression that India has seen possibly since the Mutiny, certainly since Lord Curzon's time? The obvious explanation that lies to hand is the presence of an overwhelming Tory majority within the coalition of parties which formed the so-called Government of National Union in Great Britain. Though Lord Lloyd, former Governor of Bombay and later High Commissioner to Egypt, has not been able even in the House of Lords to swing many votes against the government in its declared policy of proceeding toward a greater degree of responsible self-government in a federation of all India, and though Winston Churchill and the militant Generals and admirals in the House of Commons have had little more success, the reason lies partly in the fact that the Government seems to have moved in their direction.

The change of policy is, however, more apparent than real. Had the Labour Government remained in power we should doubtless have seen the same zeal for "law and order" in India that marks the present *régime*. Actually it was the Liberal Lord Lothian, who is still best known to Americans as Philip Kerr, whose speech to the Lords on November 24th heralded the change, and Lord Lothian is the arch-exemplar of moderation in all things. Lord Lothian minced no words in declaring the intention of His Majesty's Government to put an end to "terrorism" by curbing the press in India, and by the free use of an ordinance issued by the Viceroy at the end of October which permitted the arrest of any person known to be a member of a terrorist organization.

Two things had become apparent to the British Government by November. They were of a nature that would have forced the hand of any British cabinet to support the Viceroy in India in extreme measures of coercion. The first was that the campaign of political murders in India, particularly in Bengal, had grown to alarming intensity. It was paralleled by the growth in intensity and extent of the communal difficulties which culminated in riots like those in Cawnpore, and in dangerous demonstrations like the invasions of the teritories of Kashmir by Moslems from British India who were bent on bringing the Maharajah to terms on the treatment of his Moslem subjects. The second factor was that Mr. Gandhi, even with the magic of his loin-cloth and his goat-milk diet, was not capable of bringing the extreme Congress program into any possible reconciliation with the essential British reservations. Lord Sankey's urbane and courteous efforts to find a *via media* proved fruitless before the stubborn determination of the "humble servant of India's starving millions."

The Mahatma talked of conciliation, even of compromise. He made some real progress with the Moslems and a litttle with the Sikhs on the problem of communal representation, though he was adamant against allowing the claims of Dr. Ambedkhar for special minority privileges for the fifty or sixty millions of "untouchables" who are at once within and without the Hindoo system. But on the fundamentals of India's right to immediate Dominion status, with complete representative control over all fiscal matters, and substantial control over the army and foreign relations, the holy man exhibited an inflexibility worthy of the most exalted traditions of saintly conviction. It was a tenacity that sorely tried the patience of the British negotiators—who laid no claim to sainthood.

After the general election, that swept the slate clean for the immediate future of the Labor Party as a socialist force in England, the rumor began to leak out that the new Government was going to return to the Simon Commission's scheme for the immediate establishment of responsibility only in the Provinces, with a relegation of federation and all its complex problems to some distant future.

The Congress National Party in India had previously professed to see in federation, as planned in the first London Conference, only a scheme for anchoring the British permanently in India by the establishment of a rigid Constitution in which British interests and minorities loyal to them were given a vetoing if not an actually controlling power. The Indian Native Rulers' representation of forty or fifty per cent in the Senate, which was to have co-ordinate powers; the provisions for permitting a bare one-third of the joint membership of the two houses to retain a ministry in power against the rest; the proposed Federal Supreme Court, with its sweeping powers of judicial review; the Central Reserve Bank "removed from political influence"—all these seemed to the Congress Party to be aimed at putting permanent brakes on the development of responsible self-government in India by the Hindoo majority. To umpire a minority system would preserve British Raj in India. These suppositions were not unnatural. They were probably correct.

Now, a word about the permanent features of this matter. Here you have a thing that looks as if it meant delay of Federal India. But when there was talk of returning to the scheme of the Simon (Indian Statutory) Commission's Report, the federal scheme seemed more attractive. It had offered at least a potential rostrum for Indian nationalism, and the strong possiblity that the position of the Princes, and even of the more orthodox communalists among the Moslems, might be gradually undermined by nationalist sentiment. Only the most irresponsible of the Congress agitators really hoped to get a government over all India immediately in any form that would permit them to legislate against the wishes of the Princes in the territory of the Indian Native States. Mr. Gandhi therefore became urgent in attempting to save the federal solution, and to have it inaugurated in at least the form of an advisory Federal Council, along the lines suggested by Sir Ahbar Hydari of a joint committee of British India legislators and a delegation from the Chamber of Princes. For this he had the support of practically all the delegates of British India at the Conference, including the Moslems.

When the Conference closed he bore away a promise that federation as an ideal would remain. But the Congress would accept nothing less than federation and responsibility at the centre.

On the return of Gandhi to India the Viceroy was faced with this problem: Shall I continue the policy of conciliation after there is no further hope of conciliation —after we know that the issues have been drawn, after the penalizing and intimidation of the British Colony in India, and that the policy of the Congress is to freeze out the British commercial interest? Shall we try to clear the way for the reforms, or make it clear to India, once and for all, that we intend to stick on this line if it takes every ounce of strength that we have?

With my own traditions and background I think I should have waited longer than your ex-Governor General, Lord Willingdon, did. Remember that he had many years in India as governor of Bombay. It may have been his experience with Canadian curling, or something of that sort, as much as his Indian years that taught him the strategy that he used—he was a cricketer before he was a curler—but he judged the moment to be ripe to strike rapidly and continuously. I think, quite frankly, that he was premature. I should have waited; but I am not the man on the spot, and neither are you, and we cannot determine those matters. (Hear, hear). It is quite clear that in this instance he was faced already in

Bengal with what amounted to civil disturbance on such a scale as to make civil government almost impossble. Lord Lothian, whom you know as Philip Kerr—a Liberal if ever there was one—had announced in the House of Lords that the government no longer had any option in the matter. Now, when Philip Kerr says that, I think there is something in it.

I do not think that this struggle will solve the constitutional future, by forcing issues. The best that can come of it is to clear away obstruction. But I want to outline, if I can, the opposing forces as I see them. Here you have the Viceroy, with the ordinances at his disposal which permit him to imprison a man, put him to death, or permit the provincial governments similar powers; or to imprison women and children. There has been no such government seen in India since after the Mutiny. These ordinances do not apply to the whole of India; they apply to certain distinct areas in which revolution has been most rife; but they could be extended to all India at a moment's notice, and would be if need arose.

Under those ordinances picketing is forbidden; so are fees or contributions to the Congress Party; the whole Indian National Congress is outlawed, so that every member of it, and the associations connected with it, become outlawed. In addition to that, sweeping penalties are produced by the ordinances themselves. A man may be tried in absentia, as far as I can gather from the reports in most creditable sources, and on the outline of the evidence.

Now, those are harsh measures; those are brutal measures; those are as sweeping as anything that has been done in war-time. But the fact is that war of a sort actually existed in India. They are war measures, because, if my information on the subject is correct, it was just as much open warfare between the Congress and the British Raj, once those lines were drawn and it was seen that no concession at London would be made. Before you could go on, the non-compromise policy had to be cleared away.

I may be mistaken about that. A more concilliatory policy might have solved the matter better in the long run. Time will tell. It is certain that if these efforts on the part of the Viceroy fail, and if Indian Nationalism proves to be more powerful, through the use of the boycott and the stagnation of the commercial life of India, it is certain that those measures will not be forgotten. On the other hand, if the three committees of the Round-Table Conference are to convene in India at all, they must have the way clear of intimidation and terrorism; in short, they must be able to operate in an India in which the government supporters know that they are not going to be exposed to what could be called, without exaggeration, a stab in the back. People who back the Raj in India must know that they are going to have the Raj backing them. That, I think, is the analysis of Lord Willingdon's policy as Viceroy, and he is taking these steps to insure it.

I think the Princes, who rule over about 600 native states, of all degrees, have been somewhat disillusioned by the financial aspects of this problem; the relation of the native states to British India in relation to figures. I suggest that the problem is, from their point of view, probably the most pertinent, because the federal structure itself, as laid down in the report, gave them rather adequate protection. But the Indian Princes are not alone in this scepticism about the new regime. One of the three committees will have to deal not only with the financial problems and their relation to the Indian States, but with the franchise and the electorate. How far can you extend the franchise in India? As you all know, a very radical experiment is being made in Ceylon, where it appears to be working well; but the population there is, by and large, entirely different from that of India, and the extension of the suffrage on such a wide scale is a very different experiment.

There is always that varying problem of communal electorates; and although five minority communities are reported to have agreed in London, no agreement was found possible with the Hindoo majority itself. Until that agreement has proved to be possible, the problem defies any solution except one imposed by the government.

Now, so far as the federal problem is concerned, you have not only the Princes and the minorities to consider, but the whole structure of the federation itself, in its solution of the problem. It was not proposed to put through a parliamentary system in India, for the experience of the Dominions, from time to time, has proved that where a majority existed the evolution towards Dominion status was inevitably rather rapid. In India the federation, as it was drawn up, put two houses with coordinate power, and gave the Princes from thirty to forty per cent representation in the Upper House. I think the significance of that may appear, because Moslems are to be given a greater representation than their population strength. In short, in the only Upper Chamber, with absolutely coordinate powers in ordinary matters, this was to be done. Then the principle of responsibility itself was to be changed interestingly. The first suggested change was that only on a vote of both Houses should the Ministry resign. Then there was, above everything else, the Supreme Court of India, with powers of judicial review as sweeping as those of the Supreme Court of the United States; with the right to review not only minority powers and federal powers, and the division of powers between the two and more seats of government, but the duty to protect minority rights against the legislature itself—sweeping powers of judicial review.

Now, does it begin to appear to you why I say that federal government in India would be a great anchor for the British Government, because everybody would feel that the British Raj was its guarantor imbedded in the federal structure? It would give India a real experience in attempting to work as complicated a system as India is and must be, into some degree of unity. At the same time it would protect those individuals in India who are not willing to submit themselves to majority Hindoo rule.

Therefore I can only hope that programs for more responsible Indian rule which have culminated in this interesting proposal of federation are not to be completely set aside; that when the atmosphere is clear, and those committees can go on with their work, they may find it possible to work out a sufficient degree of consent to impose what will ultimately be necessary for all of India under a federal solution, with the rights of England safeguarded, and the rights of India taken over under a responsible legislature which can educate them in that which is essential, that is, political experience in running their own affairs, and not being simply critics of other people. (Loud applause).

The President thanked the speaker for his address.

ONTARIO'S MINING INDUSTRY AND ITS OUTLOOK FOR 1932

AN ADDRESS BY THE HON. CHARLES McCREA,
ONTARIO MINISTER OF MINES.

January 28, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

HON. MR. McCREA: The economic, political and social world is still waiting for the sunrise of better and brighter days. The world of trade and commerce is sick. It is suffering from commercial anemia. Some diagnosticians say the disease is close to the pernicious stage, or, as the doctors would put it, the patient has reached the crisis—a turn for the better is anxiously awaited, a turn for the worse is dreaded. Perhaps the patient is in the condition described by the small boy who, when asked as to the condition of his aunt, said, "Well, the Doctor says if she lives until morning he will have some hope, but if she doesn't then he thinks she will die." (Laughter.)

World trade and the production and distribution of goods have been slowed down. In some sections there is plenty. In other sections there is want and starvation. Those who need cannot buy while those who would sell cannot find purchasers. There are cargoes to move, there are highways, railways and ships ready for use, there are willing and eager hands to transport and distribute goods, but railways languish for business, ships rust at anchor, and men stand idle because of the slowing down of world trade. The world is crying for money, for stabilized exchange as a medium to assist in the distribution of the products of our farms, mines and forests for world markets so that the proceeds of these at fair prices may move back into the pockets of our people to enable them to do all the things that money can do—to pay debts and taxes, to maintain homes, to protect the great institutions of the country. Everybody is hoping for the stabilization of money, for its circulation, so that the tension of the economic stakes may be loosed to enable trade to revive again. Those who have given great study to world conditions have shown clearly that there is no general world over-production, and that there are great sections of the world where, if money and trade facilities were functioning normally, conditions would not exist as at prsent. Into that general background of world setting I introduce the subject of my talk, Ontario's mining industry and its outlook for 1932.

Now I digress for a moment to state what is elementary—that prosperity for the overwhelming majority of our people necessarily depends upon the value of the wealth crop we take from our basic industries, agriculture, forests and mines, each year. If crops are poor and prices low, if our goods are not moving out where the wealth comes back in exchange, we find conditions throughout Ontario just as they are today, with our farmers unable to do the things which money could do for them. It is the same with our mining industry except gold, and the same with our forest industry except as to the amount we are supplying for pulp and paper. Such are conditions today.

Old Mother Earth has a very capacious bosom and fortunate is the province and the country which has within its boundaries great areas of fertile land, great resources of forests and of minerals, to say nothing perhaps of the attractiveness that brings tourists and leaves that form of capital contribution with us. There are as well our fish, game and fur products.

Ontario's mining industry is one of tremendous importance to this province. I want to give you a view of that importance and the part the industry is playing in the business welfare of Ontario and of Canada. Ontario's mining industry embraces the production of metals, non-metals, structural materials and clay products. Of the metals there are gold, silver, nickel, copper, platinum, bismuth, cobalt, lead and zinc. The non-metals include actinolite, arsenic, diatomite, feldspar, fluorspar, graphite, gypsum, iron pyrites, mica, mineral waters, natural gas, peat petroleum, quartzite and quartz, silica brick, salt, talc and soapstone. The structural materials are Portland cement, hydrated lime, quicklime, sand and gravel, sand-lime brick, building stone. Of our clay products we might name brick (face, common, fancy and ornamental, sewer), drain tile, structural tile, sewer pipe, pottery made from domestic clay, haydite and other products.

By the end of 1932 we hope to add to the list of our mineral production one that has been engaging world attention, and that is radium, as well as salts of uranium in concentrated form. A mine and a mill for making concentrates is being opened up at Wilberforce, in the County of Haliburton, which we hope will swing into operation within the next thirty days. We are also looking forward to the development of the new fire clays in Northern Ontario which give promise of being the base of a new industry there, particularly because of their proximity to our deposits of lignite which are being found on the new extension of the T. & N.O. Railway between Cochrane and James Bay.

Now, what is the value to Ontario of her mineral industry? Up to the end of 1931 the total production had a value of $1,844,206,564.—(Applause). Of that, the metal group produced $1,255,000,000, while others, grouped as non-metals, structural and clay products, amounted to $588,000,000. For 1931 our production of all minerals was, in value, $98,000,000, of which around $72,500,000 represented metals; $7,700,000 non-metals; $13,500,000 structural products; and $4,300,000 of clay products. The last three years, comparing the figures with our total mineral production in 1929, 1930, and 1931, was, in 1929, $117,000,000; in 1930, $113,000,000; in 1931, $98,000,000.

Our estimate for 1932—of which I will speak later—is $103,000,000; so we are down in nickel, copper, silver, cobalt, platinum, lead and zinc, and in non-metals as well; but we are up in gold. The production of those metals simply reflects general world conditions.

However, $98,000,000 of new weath is a very substantial contribution to the business life of Ontario. That amount is strikingly illustrated if we compare it with the field crop production of Ontario and other provinces in Canada. The report made by the Bureau of Statistics at Ottawa, issued within the last few weeks, showed that Ontario field crops last year had a value of $124,500,000, which was some $26,5000,000 over our $98,000,000. Alberta, the next largest in field production, had crops worth $97,249,000; thus Ontario's mineral production last year was three-quarters of a million greater than the field crop production in Alberta. Quebec had $72,801,000 field crop, which was surpassed by Ontario's mining industry by $25,750,000. Our mining returns surpassed Saskatchewan's field crop by $32,000,000; surpassed Manitoba's field crops by $63,000,000; British Columbia's by $85,500,000; New Brunswick by $87,500,000; Nova Scotia by $88,000,000, and Prince Edward Island by $91,000,000. Thus our mineral production shows a very favorable contrast with agriculture in other provinces as to size and importance.

Now, it is upon our metal mines that the chief interest is usually fixed, and of those two branches stand out—the great nickel mines of the Sudbury area and the great gold mines of Porcupine, Kirkland Lake and other outlying districts in this Province. One could take hours to discuss these branches without exhausting the subject; but let it suffice to say of the nickel industry that this giant enterprise, outstanding in the mineral world, with great mineral reserves, large and modern equipment, smelters, refineries and fabricating plants, is slowed down because of world trade conditions.

In 1930 it had a total capital investment in plant, machinery, tools—but not including mineral deposits—of practically $95,000,000. Its plants in Ontario can produce 140,000,000 pounds of refined nickel and 240,000,000 pounds of refined copper per annum. It is now running at 25 or 30 per cent capacity, employing at present 3,350 men, and producing 90 per cent of the world's nickel consumption. Its research department is working at all times, under all conditions, to find new uses for these metals so as to increase the production of new products. Its ore tonnage production for 1931 is down 15 per cent. Its production of copper is also down. There are great ore reserves there indicating a very long life, and the nickel industry stands ready, fit and efficient, to swing into wider business action as soon as trade conditions improve.

In addition, adjacent to the property, the great chemical plants and acid plants stand ready to serve the world markets; while out to the east of Sudbury is also the Falconbridge nickel plant which is playing a part in production, but like all others it is affected by general world conditions.

The other great branch of the industry is gold. I suppose many of you will remember the lines of Tom Hood:

Gold, gold, gold, gold,
Heavy to get and light to hold;
Spurned by the young, but hugged by the old
To the very verge of the churchyard's mould,
Gold, gold, gold, gold.

Ontario's gold mines since 1900 have played a very important part. Their production in 1901 was nil; ten years later, in 1911, there was some $42,000 worth of gold produced. Ten years later, 1921, that had risen to $14,500,000; while in 1931, last year, the total production reached $43,000,000. (Applause.) In these years of general depression we have played an outstanding part in stabilizing business in this country and in helping Canada to ride the storm. To the end of 1931 the total gold production in Ontario was in excess of $394,000,000.

From the great Porcupine camp there came of that total $285,044,739, and from the younger camp, Kirkland Lake, $101,338,000. For 1931, Porcupine produced between nineteen and twenty million dollars, while Kirkland Lake grabbed the major role with a production in excess of Porcupine, its total being $21,789,767.

There are fifteen producing mines in the Province of Ontario, six of them at Porcupine, six at Kirkland Lake, and three in what might be called Northwestern Ontario, including the Howey at Red Lake, the Minto and Parkhill north of Sault Ste. Marie.

Our production of $43,000,000 last year was up twenty per cent above 1930, and this production was four-fifths of the total production of Canada. For 1931 the tonnage averaged 14,285 tons daily, with an average grade of $8.50. These mills ground out, in value, $120,000 a day, or $3,600,000 a month, and $43,000,000 for the twelve months, showing an excess of $7,000,000 for 1931 over $36,000,000 in 1930.

The gold industry employed, in 1930, 6,624 men; in 1931, 8,216—an increase of 25 per cent. Wages of the gold industry in 1931 were $13,000,000, while mining equipment and supplies required an expenditure of another $13,000,000. This increase, both in production and men employed, helped to maintain the high peak employment which this industry has been furnishing. The peak of all men engaged in the entire mining industry was in 1929, when 18,994 men were employed; in 1931 the men employed were 18,267, or a total depression of employment of three per cent in the mining industry.

Kirkland Lake is now the banner gold production camp of Northern Ontario, and gold is now classed as Canada's most valuable mineral product, surpassing in value coal, which had been leading for many years. Canada's gold production for 1931 was $55,391,000, while her coal production was $41,320,000—a difference of some $14,000,000. This industry, as you will see, is one of the bright spots in Ontario business life, and has contributed materially to the welfare of the province and in maintaining business during this last couple of years.

Now, what is the outlook for 1932? After going into the whole picture carefully, sizing up the likelihoods in all directions, we are able to say that it looks brighter in all branches for 1932. (Applause.) The metals, other than gold, have been on a reaction in world trade, and we are hoping there will be a bigger demand for other metals than in the past year; we cannot conceive how production can go down very much lower. We estimate that in 1932 Ontario will produce at least $50,000,000 in gold, or an increase again of $7,000,000 for the ensuing year. This is based on the mine performances for the past quarter, and also because some new producers will come into play during 1932. We expect one in the Porcupine district; one in the extension of the Kirkland Lake belt; the Ashley Mining Corporation at Bannockburn; while we also expect in the Thunder Bay area to see the Moss Mine in production before the year is over. But even assuming that these three do not come in, we would still figure a production slightly over $50,000,000 for the year.

Our output of non-metals in 1931 was $7,700,000; we expect 1932 will see that up to $8,000,000. We expect a slight decrease in our structural materials; we figure these at $10,000,000 for 1932 as against $13,500,000 for 1931. Clay products will rank about the same as last year.

When talking of gold production, it is interesting to get the world outlook, to gather all the statistics as to world gold production which we regard as reliable. Gold production in 1932 is expected to show an excess of $7,000,000 to $10,000,000 over 1931. The expectations for 1933 look like a world decline; and the same for 1934 and 1935, and on down to 1940, where it is expected the production will fall to $370,000,000 as against $410,000,000 for 1932.

There are possible factors which may off-set that decline. One of the interesting features, particularly in these days when gold is hailed as the great king metal, is that with the growth and extension of world business there comes the inevitable necessity for new metallic money to take care of that increase. Just as a man with a capital of $100,000 invested in business reaches a place where he needs more capital, and just as our great Hydro-Electric Power development must figure on an additional supply each year to take care of present load and new demands, so the great business world must figure on an additional supply of gold to back our currencies as metallic money to take care of a growing world business. The problems facing all those who are endeavoring to straighten out the great money question to-day is this one of sufficiency of gold, and whether, lacking a sufficiency, consideration should not be given to using the old-time consort of gold—silver—to play a greater part in world money than it has played in recent years.

New mines and low-grade ore, with improved mining methods, may bring about an increase in gold production. We look confidently to see in Ontario, as the years go by, new mines and new production from great low-grade operations to substantially increase Ontario's gold production. Our prospects in that regard are excellent. In the great preCambrian area there are vast sections that have never been prospected; there are great areas which will be combed again, and undoubtedly there will be found new gold mines. In addition to that factor, we may assume that there will be a new source of gold production in our low-grade ore bodies, because of the large tonnage handled and because of improved mining methods. Let me tell you just what I mean by those low-grade deposits. Our gold mines in Ontario to-day may be said to be high-grade deposits, and our prospectors have been looking for the sort of deposit that runs from $7 to $10 and upwards in gold value per ton. When the Howey mine was opened up in the Northwestern section, where there were great widths, and large bodies could be handled, it was found that the costs of the ordinary mine, running all the way from $4 to $6 per ton for mining and milling, could be reduced to $2.70 per ton, allowing for taxes and depreciation. Therefore our ore bodies running from $3 to $4 will be highly prized deposits, and our prospectors will go back over the ground which they combed before, and look for those lower-grade deposits which were passed up as useless. All mining men believe that these low-grade ores can be handled, and they are watching with interest these great deposits over the province of Quebec in the township of Beattie, where the Nipissing and Ventures have been giving some attention to development along that line. There are 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 tons of ore there worth $3.50 a ton. There are additional millions of tons of ore there at $3.00 per ton. Whether they can be made to pay depends upon the extent of tonnage procured, the fairness of prices and taxation, and the cheapness of power, so keeping the cost down to the place where the operation can be made profitable.

The whole question is one of intense interest. One looks at the great Alaska-Juneau Mine, where millions of tons of ore worth a dollar per ton in gold coin are being raised, milled and handled for something less than 70 cents a ton. That means, however, that they are handling per day 8,000 tons or 9,000 tons. It means that the cost of power is around $9.00 or $10.00 where they have it developed. It means the digging into a great mountain where ore rises above and is brought down by gravity and milled, and where every facility is established for cheap milling. These operations show the possibilities of low-grade ore in this province and other parts for the production of gold in a bigger way than most people anticipate when worked on a really large scale.

As showing what can be done, let me point out that 15 mines in Ontario to-day are grinding some 14,285 tons, and producing $43,000,000, or $120,000 within the day. On those low-grade lines, a mine producing 5,000 tons a day at $3.50 will produce $17,500 a day in gold, and seven or eight of those will double the present gold production of Ontario or of Canada. So that the outlook is one which is not only intriguing, but which mining men have reason to pin their faith to as being entirely practical and within the limits of probability.

Ontario has a Government which has always taken a very keen interest in this mining development. It has realized the importance of this as a basic industry for Ontario, and so we endeavour to afford to that mining world every opportunity and assistance to go on increasing production and turning latent, useless wealth, stored up in the hills, into new wealth for the stimulation of the streams of trade.

Our department each year has its geological surveys. Last year we sent out 11 or 12 parties with a geologist at the head of each party, who goes into the outlying sections, who works with our prospectors, reads the riddles of the rocks, and comes back with reports that are published with maps, and thus provides very substantial assistance to our prospectors in the search for gold. Our prospectors, as a group, are perhaps the best in Canada. For the last twenty years those men have been receiving a very practical education, not only by following their vocation in the field, but also by attending the classes and lectures which the Department of Mines provides for them throughout the winter months in the different mining sections of the province. A geologist will go for one or two weeks and teach those men the rudiments of geology and chemistry, rock-spotting, and assisting them generally to pursue their endeavours more intelligently. These men deserve the backing and support of men of Ontario who are not obliged to risk a dollar in finding mines. (Applause.) Those men know their job, and they have been in the van of discoveries in every province, in Manitoba and Quebec.

There are other places in Canada than Ontario where gold is likely to be found, but this province is in first place, and we should determine that it shall maintain that banner place. (Hear, Hear!) If our mining industry is to maintain our present production and increase it, it is absolutely necessary to open up new areas and to find new mines, and necessary that men of vision and courage should risk some of their wealth—which has indirectly reached them through these very men— in staking them. I ask you men, both in this room and beyond, on the confines of the air, to take an interest in this search for wealth.

I know that perhaps many will say, "Yes, we have invested money, and we have been stung," so to speak. Well, our gold mines alone have produced almost $350,000,000 and the faith of those who stuck to them has been rewarded. Of course you must hold out a plum in prospect so that the interest may be stimulated, that others shall search and find—because it is just as true in the material as in the spiritual world—"Seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you." (Applause.)

We look forward to a bigger, brighter and a better year. Already younger men and newer areas are appearing on the horizon. The Ashley, in Bannockburn, gives promise of heralding a new camp in that area. From all accounts we have been able to get, Ashley may be pronounced a mine, even as a small one at this time; but others also started in a small way. There are new areas in other sections. Up in northwest of Sudbury, west of Cochrane, at Three Duck Lake, at Swayze, at Little Long Lake, up in the MacKenzie Island section, up north of Port Arthur and in other areas, there are gold finds throughout the province of Ontario from Quebec to the Manitoba boundary, which give promise of success and of increased production.

Sitting at this head table with me to-day are some of the members of the staff of our Department of Mines. There is Thomas W. Gibson, veteran Deputy Minister of Mines. (Applause.) There is Tom Sutherland, who is Acting Deputy. (Applause.) There is G. R. Mickle, the Mine Assessor. (Applause.) There is Mr. Burrows, the Chief Geologist; while down in the room are Messrs. Young and Rogers, our statisticians, Mr. McNeill of the Assay Department, Mr. Sinclair, our Chief Mine Inspector, and I think Judge Godson is here. (Applause.) These are the men behind the scenes who administer the laws of the province of Ontario, and no more loyal, faithful and competent group on the Government administration for this province exists. (Applause.) They are ready, as I am, to serve and work for those who are interested in mining and its possibilities. As we look out upon 1932, knowing the courage, capacity and enterprise of our prospecting and mining men, knowing the assistance which is standing behind them on the part of the Government, knowing something of Northern Ontario and its possibilities; I have greater optimism and enthusiasm for mining development in Ontario at the beginning of 1932 than ever before. (Applause.) That faith is built upon past performances, present indications, and the great mining personnel; and in taking leave of you to-day I only wish to add—play your part in solidifying this great interest; first, perhaps, from a selfish standpoint, but secondly, because it is a contribution to the very life-blood of Ontario's business and one that will lead Ontario to even greater heights than it has hitherto reached. (Loud Applause.)

The President thanked the speaker for his informing address.

THE TRUE INDIA

An Address by MR. ABDULLAH YUSUF ALI, C.B.E., I.C.S., M.A., Etc.

Thursday, February 4, 1932

Col. B. O. Hooper, presiding in the absence of President Drew, introduced the speaker.

Mr. Ali: Let me say what pleasure it gives me to address a meeting of this Club. As I look around me I see the strongest feature in the decorations is our beloved Union Jack, (Applause) I feel almost at home. If I had been in India I should have seen the same flag with just one little difference—in the corner where you place your Canadian arms we place our Little Star of India. But is not that the beauty of the Empire, that with all its variety it is one. (Applause.) Queen Elizabeth had for her motto a Latin sentence—*"Semper idem"*—meaning, "Always the same". I think we may consider all citizens of our great Empire as always the same, whether north or south, east or west, and it is a great privilege to be a citizen of such an Empire, and speaking humbly for myself, to be an exponent of one part of that Empire to others. (Applause.)

You ask me to address you to-day on the real India. As we go through the world I wonder whether sometimes our belief is not shaken in the reality of things as we pass from one surrounding to another. As I pass through the United States I often hear or read my country described, and wonder whether there is such a thing. (Laughter). Before I beg to place before you a picture of the real India as I see it, I should like to show you some false pictures which are sometimes put forward. For instance, there is the picture of a country of philosophers, all engaged in spiritual contemplation. (Laughter.) It may be a very beautiful picture, but I wonder how many of us would like as our ordinary companions in life, highbrow philosophers always contemplating? (Laughter.) Many of you have probably read those classic lines of Matthew Arnold, very beautiful, and founded on true knowledge:—

The East bowed low before the blast
In sullen, slow disdain;
She let the legions thunder past,
Then plunged in thought again. (Laughter).

If Matthew Arnold had been living to-day, not in Canada, but let us say in Shanghai—I wonder what he would have thought about life? The fact is that if a poet wishes to conjure up a dream he can always do so, whether it is about India or China or Timbuctoo. You have also some beautiful word pictures by a writer belonging to a great southern neighbour of yours—Emerson—with a great deal about India. He wrote a wonderful poem of a Brahmin—I wish it were India.

Well, we must not feed ourselves merely on the pictures of an East that never was in East or West—just an ignorant, visionary dream. There is another kind of picture placed before us by an even greater writer—a picture that places before you some unusual, fantastic figure high on the horizon, and calls him the standard-bearer of a new age. We are told that this sickening world is only to be redeemed by economic doctrines which to ordinary people appear to lead to barbarism. We are told by Monsieur Rolland that a great light has appeared in India which is to illumine the darkness of the world, that will make for peace and good-will and love amongst mankind. We have seen that light at much nearer quarters, and we find that it has led not to peace but to disaster, not to progress but to disorganization, not to improved life but to great confusion of issue. We must beware of pictures of that kind.

But there is a third kind of false picture which is positively dangerous, which places before you a united people in India struggling to be free, but kept down by the iron despotism of England. You know Lord and Lady Willingdon. Can you imagine Lord Willingdon to be crushing down with iron despotism the will of a united people? Can you imagine that gentle, patient, long-suffering Viceroy who has done all he could to give every rope and latitude to every kind of opinion and feeling, reasonable or unreasonable—is that the man, at the close of his great and wonderful career, to crush down the liberties and trample upon the thoughts and ambitions of a humble people?

I ask you to dismiss these pictures altogether from your minds. I ask you to sit down and make up your mind that in the real study of India you will meet with people who are human beings like yourselves, not high-brow philosophers all the time contemplating, but simple, ordinary, every-day people who have their difficulties, their misunderstandings, their superstitions, their prejudices, but also a little of the saving grace of humor which will make us all akin throughout the world. (Applause.)

Let me therefore now go back to the bed-rock reality and offer my picture in oppositon to some of those beautiful colors which seem to capture the imagination of our younger people. At least they will have the merit of being able to stand the closest scrutiny. When you go to the country with opinions formed on the basis of actual facts you will say to yourselves: "Why, here is a country and a people which deserve my sympathy and affection, apart from any further tie of Empire, and the unity of being subjects of the British Crown." (Applause.)

The first great fact that any one is impressed with in India is its poverty. How can I give you an idea of that poverty? You realize that there are millions and millions of people in that country whose daily income is not probably higher than eight annas a day—eight annas being exactly sixteen cents. Of course you have to make allowance; you have to realize that in the milder climate like that of India ordinary necessities of life cost very much less; you need not clothe so heavily as you do here—although, of course, I am not one of those who advocate the dress that is worn by a certain representative of my country who figured largely lately. (Laughter).

Poverty in itself may be a great incentive to efforts, to self-improvement, to great deeds that lead to a great future. I am saying nothing against poverty in itself; but when that poverty is combined with a sort of propaganda which glorifies that poverty, then it is time to pause and think how far such a gospel is worthy of acceptation. There is another danger in that poverty problem; you know that the worst kind of beggar is the one who parades his sores, and in most countries such a form of mendicancy is a crime. But the worst form of poverty is that which parades itself before the world, and which lays the blame for it not on the real cause, but, say, on a foreign government. I have frequently heard long diatribes on the policy of England which has deprived India of all wealth. There is a sort of imaginary drive of all gold into England—the Bank of England would only be too glad if it were true—which thinks that year after year a tribute of millions of gold has been exacted from India, and that Indian merchants have been deprived of their livelihood until they stand to-day as they do. That is not true. What is true is that that poverty is linked up with a number of other features that I am going to describe now, and its removal is only possible if you make a contract all along the line; and it is more probable, indeed, through the institutions of the British flag than on any other conditions. (Applause.)

The second great feature that you will notice in India is ignorance. Ignorant people sometimes are very likeable people, but when ignorance is combined with, shall we say, a swelled head, it becomes insufferable. It becomes intolerable to your neighbors, but it becomes dangerous to yourself. We have a great mass of illiteracy; I think ninety per cent of the people of India are illiterate. Education is making rapid strides, and yet to-day, with free and compulsory education in some small municipalities, India can show no better result than that ninety per cent of illiteracy. How does that square with the other things? As I have said, each of these causes I am going to mention is linked with the others, and if you deal with each singly you do not get very far, but you will get very far if you interconnect them and then carry on your measures for the amelioration of the people.

It is not merely illiteracy that I call ignorance. I have met many illiterate village folk who were, according to the best statistics, very intelligent people; they could discuss with me on equal terms. But we find in India, even in our schools and colleges, a kind of knowledge which becomes angular, which does not fit itself into things—you probably know it in your country, too,—and that kind of knowledge is almost more useless than ignorance itself. We have now eighteen universities; all but five of them were the creations of the last few years; that is to say, since the great Coronation Durbar held by Their Majesties, King George and Queen Mary. Although those eighteen universities are trying hard to improve their constitution and their government, their curricula and their standards of teaching, I am very sorry to say they are very far from attaining the standards that we require of institutions of high learning.

Do not think I am prejudiced here. I have been connected with half a dozen universities in my own country, and the last with whose govenment I had to do was a very great university known only in India; but we find throughout a demand not for knowledge, not for high contemplated philosophy, but a demand for degrees—and for degrees in order that they may lead to positions under the government. (Laughter.) Well, if you reduce a university to merely a degree-producing machine to feed the dialectician you will find that a greater increase means greater discontent, and not greater salvation for that country. We have very few educated workmen. Our old artisans had inherited skill, but that skill has not been brought into contact with the demands of the market so that they could go on producing things after the same pattern and in the same method as their fathers and grandfathers and greatgrandfathers did before them. But we have an increase of the other product. They cannot sell them, and therefore you cannot say that that knowledge or that skill has been applied in the most practicable way to the daily affairs of life. The great need for education in India is to make it practical, to bring it into touch with every kind of life, to make our industrialists, who complain of the inefficiency of Indian labor, welcome our youth from schools and universities instead of fighting shy of it, as they are doing now.

Then the third great feature that you will notice is the total disunion in the life of the people. You will see that disunion in various forms. You will see it in the humblest village. Let us suppose the question in a village of about fifty houses is the water supply. Perhaps one well is enough for the population, but if only one well is left there, many heads will be broken. The Brahmins will not draw water from the same well as the Pariah. The Untouchables are not allowed to come within measurable distance of that well. You have got one well labelled for the Brahmin, and another well very far out of the village for the Pariah, and you have settlements and locations in the same way. A small group of people living together make a common social life. Go to the larger towns and municipalities. You in the West know a municipality to be a geat nursery of civic virtue—at least it should be so. (Laughter.) Unregenerate nature finds out the weak points everywhere—(laughter)—but at least you are a people with city conveniences, you have a decent supply of roads, hospitals, schools; and even though you may dispute most violently amongst yourselves as to the kind of buildings to erect or the kind of taxes you are to levy, there is a fair amount of agreement which enables you to carry on a common life.

I wish I could say that of our municipalities. I wish we could find in India municipalities working for the people of their cities instead of always flying off at a tangent on political hobby-horses as they are constantly doing, perhaps not without example from other quarters. The worst feature that we have to deal with in India is what I may call the spirit of fecklessness, a sort of *malais* of attitude—"Oh, it does not matter what you do; nothing can put it right." Now, a man or community may lose many things, but as soon as he loses courage he nearly loses the battle. In India we want confidence above all—confidence amongst each other, confidence in our established institutions, confidence in our governments, confidence in the general future; and those leaders who have done so much to sap the foundations of confidence have a great deal to answer for. Perhaps in your heart of hearts you may think that I am speaking allegorically of other countries as well. Perhaps I am. (Laughter.) Perhaps the whole world suffers from that; just for that reason the world will realize that when the foundations of confidence are shaken in social life, in religion, in institutions generally, to what low depths we must go before we can set out on a new life!

Perhaps the worst feature in our life is herd mentality. The function of education is to train up men and women to think independently for themselves. I do not think a very large proportion of mankind ever reach that state completely; but at any rate, in every civilized community there are centres—foci—established where you have a group of people who gather together and bring the best of their ideas to the great question that I have asked. Then you naturally have a formation of big and small groups who discuss things amongst themselves, through their newspapers, through their party organs, through their party and their politics, and ultimately, with the balance swinging to and fro, you at least have an approximation to the common sense of the people as organized nationally. Do we find that in India? We find a complete lack of balance. We find our account of the new conditions in which our university youth are out of touch with the older life of the people, and that the older people are out of touch with modern conditions; you find a total lack of cohesion. We cannot get people together. We cannot get them to learn teamwork. We find whenever we meet nationals of other countries that that is the one thing which we could do a great deal more with. In Asiatic countries we study the history of Japan. I am not going to uphold Japan as an example of all virtues, but I do say that the Japanese have shown an adhesiveness, a power of concentration, a capacity to face facts in their reality and to face the situation, which has brought them within fifty years from a small nation scarcely known to the outside world to a big nation which can stir up the depths of international politics. (Applause.)

These, then, are some of the basic features which we have to deal with—hard realities which no amount of glossing over can ever subdue except by methods that I shall now begin to sketch.

Probably you see that our problems are not merely surface problems; they are not problems of one government or another; they are not problems which an alien government cannot solve and which our own government will be able to solve at once. On the contrary, I assure you they are problems which an Indian government, if set up to-morrow, would find it more difficult to tackle than a government which is unconnected with all the different factions and cliques that exist in the country. (Applause.)

Let us look at those problems in their proper perspective. You know that a picture may be perfectly true in every detail and yet may be absolutely false in its perspective. If a man draws a picture in which the feet are enlarged until they look bigger than the head, obviously you recognize that as a false picture. So in Indian affairs when we have constantly placed before us the political problem, as if it is the final end of all Indian questions, I feel that you are tackling the whole question from the wrong end, when you get to the bed-rock of things and then come to their expression in political terms.

Well, the first thing amongst the problems is how to deal with the dense mass of ignorance I told you about.

That places education in the forefront of our problems. (Applause). After twenty-five years of public service, some of it in the highest positions under the government, I felt that it was my duty to go back to the country and work in education. I felt that if I could organize a college, a university, I could bring as much experience and knowledge as I had to bear on the everyday problems which confront the teachers; and I still feel that that is the first and most essential problem in India. Therefore, I ask you to support and sympathize with every appeal made to you on behalf of the right kind of education which will bring our young men and women towards an enlarging of their own minds and widening their horizon. (Applause.) Of course we suffer under great disadvantages in spreading education. Our country speaks many languages; there are at least twelve major languages and a number of dialects, and under those circumstances you can understand how difficult it is to carry the torch of knowledge. You who in Canada know the difficulty of organizing education in only two languages can realize what complicated questions would arise if any tactless proposals were made which would upset established usages as regards language in the various parts of India. You have very efficient means of daily education such as my friend, Major Ney, provides for you in the National Council of Education, and such as your radio provides from hour to hour in bringing the ideas of many different minds to all kinds of audiences. Could we do that in India? If we did it, we should have to do it in different languages, and you know how difficult it is to organize the same thing in language after language, and get people to appreciate and understand.

Next after education is the big problem of sanitation and the laws of life. The great war, while it had many lamentable features, at least brought home to us the question of national health; and when we look around India we find the physique of the people below par—C.3 somebody called it—then we know what a tremendous problem we are facing. When we find ignorant mothers producing baby after baby every year and not knowing how to take care of those little lives we find the mortality amongst children under one year of age rising as high as 300 per thousand. Then you can imagine we have a very big problem. If you look at the lives of our leading men you will see how young they die. A man at forty is supposed to be old, and a man like me who at sixty goes about around Canada in your northern climate is supposed to be something of a prodigy. (Laughter.) Well, these are very big problems to tackle. We have hospitals, nurses, health organizations of every kind, but they all work under difficulty because you are coming up against some social prejudice, some custom, some superstition which you must conquer before your service is efficient. Some of your people, nurses or doctors, have probably had to work in the field of health in India, and they will tell you how heartbreaking it is when you have done your best to organize some service, for one link to break—a link which depends upon your patient himself or herself—and all your work is rendered nugatory.

Thirdly, we want a good fight put up against separatism of all kinds—separatism of castes, of political propaganda, and the silly separatism which thinks that India is going to be better by cutting herself off from the British flag. (Applause.) When the story of what that flag has done for India is told in its true colors and with the fullness of detail that it demands you will find that a great deal of that movement of separatism itself is due to the feeling of liberty and of social equality that has been implanted by English Education. (Applause.) We want the cement of cohesiveness—better institutions, better education, better social system, better political life; and that cement can best be applied by the well-tried institutions of a race whose history is a great example in the modern world of slow and steady progress, of a gradual comprehension of other races within the circle, until all races can feel a pride in the great Union Jack.

(Applause.)

There is just one fourth point which is equally important, and it must be tackled before your political institutions can grow up efficient, and that is the modern economic and industrial methods. We are not going to solve India's problems by turning our back on the whole experience of mankind. We are not going to do it by spinning the spinning-wheel. We can only do it by facing the facts of God's wide world; by trying to understand how machinery came, and what its uses are for the real elevation of humanity. After all, machinery is the development of the tool idea, and all civilization depends upon bringing mechanical means to do the work which to a certain extent it is not fit for men to tackle. Man has a higher destiny. Man should have leisure, and that leisure can only come by proper use of machinery and modern methods of industrial organization. (Applause.)

Now, gentlemen, I do not want to tire you by outlining other ideas, but I think I have said enough to show you that the great problems of India are the essential problems which cut life at the very bottom, and yet have their influence right up to the very top. And now, at the apex of it all, stands the problem of political machinery—that which is engendering so much heat, which seems to some people as the only thing that matters to India. How are we going to translate all those ideals into actual terms of politics? In that connection I will content myself on the present occasion merely in stating they are big issues. I have in other places gone further into details of these problems, but here I will state the three main issues—issues which we have got to face primarily, but which I think will also interest you.

The first issue that I always put in India is this: Is India to confine herself to the old tradition, or to come out into line with the Empire and the world? Many so-called reformers are reformers in public, but in private reactionaries. I put to them that issue plainly—do you want, or do you not want, the progress of the modern world? If you do not, with what face do you come forward and claim representative institutions and modern institutions? But, on the other hand, if you do, then how is it you still lurk behind old superstitions and still take refuge behind old forms? You must make up your mind. Either India is going to be a modern country, and to place modern countries on equal terms, or India will go under—go into an anarchy worse than China, and become a country which will be a by-word for other nations' contempt.

Secondly, I will put this issue: By what method is India to attain self-government? By sulky methods—methods of retiring into a corner, or defiance to law, or fantastic appeals to mob mentality, or by the simple, ordinary, common sense method of cooperation and self-education? (Applause.) There may be glory in the other method, but sound sense will only be found in the methods that have been tried by all people, and that have always succeeded in history.

Thirdly, I would ask the politicians of my country, is India's best interest in the Empire or outside? Many people will glibly tell you: "Oh, our ills are due to our being under a foreign government." My reply is:—Can you not make that foreign government your own by becoming so well versed in those institutions that you can carry on those institutions, and set an example to the world of what British education and British freedom can mean for you? (Applause.) They were not incapable in Canada and in South Africa and various other parts, in all other races of having been incorporated, and so incorporated that to-day they stand among the most loyal subjects of King George. (Applause.)

If India stood by herself, what would be her credit? Before the war she was able to borrow at three or three and one-half per cent. To-day, when the world is in turmoil, and even rich cities find it difficult to float loans—I am not referring to Canadian cities, where the loans are very successful—(laughter)—even to-day India's credit, thanks to a succession of able Finance Ministers, stands high, and on the stock market the Indian securities are still amongts the most valued trustee securities. Are you going to pull down that structure which has been built by two centuries of effort? And have you any chance of building up anything that will command the confidence of business men throughout the world? Is it not better to become partners in a firm that has a world-wide stake, whose partners can be met with in Canada and in Australia and in Europe and America and in the farthestest confines of the world? Is it not better to join the partners, to learn from their experience, to use their books, their customs, and ultimately to make your own business prosperous and successful beyond the dreams of avarice? (Loud Applause.)

Rev. Dr. Cody expressed the thanks of the Club for the brilliant address.

THE WORLD CRISIS AND THE OUTLOOK

AN ADDRESS BY RABBI BARNETT R. BRICKNER

Thursday, February 11, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

RABBI BRICKNER: I am getting to be almost a perennial in your midst. My frequent comings back ought to be an omen of something, and perhaps it may be an omen of the fact that the good times, too, may be coming back (Laughter); at least we hope so together.

The other day I heard the dispute between three men, representing different professions, as to the question "Which is the oldest profession in the world?". The dispute was between a surgeon, an engineer, and a politician. The surgeon said that he believed that his profession was the oldest, and for proof went back to the story of Genesis. He said that when God made woman he made her out of the rib of Adam, and certainly that required a surgical operation, hence his profession was the oldest.

The engineer said that he could go even farther back, because man was the last of the acts of creation, and before that God had planned the world and built a cosmos out of chaos, and the planning and the building of the world out of chaos into cosmos necessitated the engineer, and hence he thought his profession was even older than that of the surgeon.

But the politician pooh-poohed both of them, and he said: "You said the world was made from chaos into cosmos, but the question is who made the original chaos". (Applause; laughter.) And it is with a geat deal of the original question with which we are dealing this afternoon.

The entire world is in a state of flux. It is upset in its attempt to devise a new common denominator by which to divide the products of man's labour. The world seems to-day convulsed in an intensive effort to find a method of properly distributing the things nature yields and man produces. Here we are facing the paradox of a period of famine amidst plenty. I think in all the annals of human history this is the first time that any generation of man has been confronted with that dilemma. Up to now, our problem consisted in getting rid of the surplus population, because the food supply did not keep pace with the growing population, and you may remember Malthus' solution of that problem and through the development of modern science and its application to new features, through the balancing of birth over death, in most of the countries of the world, we are confronted with the dilemma to-day of a world that produces more than its people consume. Verily the whole world, and particularly we on this Continent, seem to have been converted into a nation of Midases; anything we touched had a tendency to turn to gold, and now, especially in the country from which I come, across the line we seem to have almost three-fifths of the world's gold in our treasury and yet we seem to be starving in the midst of its glitter.

We are in the midst, therefore, of a very intensified knowledge, which we face inevitably by the failure of a worn-out system of the past to fit in with present conditions. It is clear that through modern means of communication, of exchange, and of transportation, the whole world to-day, more than ever before, is now one of economic co-relationship. We are all in the same boat, and when the financial and economic seas rather disturb that, we are all bound to feel the rocking of the boat, even though the world may have put some of us in a favourite seat in that boat.

I do not believe myself that the extreme gravity of the world's crises can be exaggerated. The conservative-minded people amongst us say, "Never mind, it is no worse to-day than it was after the Napoleonic wars; we got over that, or at least the generation of that day got over that, and to a higher upland, and why not we?". They said "We came through other crises unscathed, into greater prosperity".

I have a feeling, my friends, which I do not think all of you will share with me, but I believe that these conservative-minded people who keep reminding themselves of this cyclical theory of life are our worst enemies.

I want to quote just a line from a letter which Governor Norman of the Bank of England sent to Governor Morais of the Bank of France, in which he said:

> "Unless drastic measures are taken to save it, the capitalistic system throughout the civilized world will be wrecked within a year. I should like this prediction to be filed for future reference."

Remember, gentlemen, this is no radical speaker; Governor Norman of the Bank of England is a man of great and to some extent conservative parts; a warning like that needs to be heeded. Sir Arthur Salter, another great Englishman, for many years the head of the Economic Section of the League of Nations, in referring to the international situation in the last quarterly isssue of the "Yale Review" wrote: "This is a grave and indeed a terrific prospect; the foundations of the systems under which we have grown up are threatening many of the institutions which for the main part are economical and political structures which must be destroyed or profoundly modified."

A great paralysis which we seem unable to diminish has taken hold of our machine installations, the machine which 150 years ago created the first industrial revolutions in the world, and now finds itself in the position of destroying that which it initially created. We are passing through what I believe to be the second industrial revolution. Fifteen nations in the last year, involving more than one quarter of the world's population, have been forced off the gold standard; ten countries have defaulted their internal obligations; revolution and disorder have affected nearly one-half of the world's population, and the whole future seems uncertain.

I want to raise this question in the minds of thinking people. May it not be that we are at the end of one era in history and at the beginning of another? May it not be that, in this generation, the word "finis" is being written to that conception which characterized the 18th and 19th centuries, and may we not be at the beginning of the new and different era of human history?

I have a feeling that the future historians will record the year 1914, which marked the beginning of the world war, in the same way as did the historians record the date of the fall of Rome. Not alone is our whole economic system in collapse—invisible collapse—in every other domain of human thought and activity are there revolutionary forces at work. I say advisedly "revolutionary forces."

In the field of religion, the older Orthodoxies are crumbling. In the field of morals, the old standards seem to be going; we are not quite sure where. In Government, democracy is giving rise to fascism and to communism. Just study the sort of world in which we live and ask yourselves whether it does not show all of the symptoms of a civilization passing out, and a new different kind of world coming to take its place?

Let me this afternoon make a hasty review of the world picture as it strikes the pivotal countries of the world. In the United States of America, over 8,000,000 people are unemployed; private philanthrophy is breaking down. To meet the situation covering the coming spring it will require something over $700,000,000, and all the community chests in the United States put together cannot collect $100,000,000. It means that in the United States, the Governments, Federal, State and Municipal, are faced with the problem of extending what would be called in England a "dole". Unemployment insurance has already been enacted in the State of Wisconsin, and I believe is on the way to being enacted throughout the various states of the Union. We are learning across the line that the United States of America is not and cannot be self-contained as a nation, despite its 122,000,000 people. How can it be self-contained when more than one-half of the cotton, one-third of the copper and tobacco, one-fifth of the wheat and flour, one-eighth of the refined oil, one-quarter of the agricultural machinery, and one-tenth of automobiles over there were exported in 1929? How can a country be completely self-contained and an isolationist in the face of those facts? How can the producers of those commodities hope to prosper without the restoration of the foreign markets (Hear, hear.); and how can the foreign markets pay in gold dollars for American exports if the Americans will neither lend gold dollars abroad, nor buy the foreign goods (Hear, hear.) (Applause); how can gold dollars be loaned to them while the world is in upheaval, and yet if the producers of those basic commodities are not prosperous; if their producers cannot hope to have a profitable domestic market for their goods, how can normal conditions be restored?

In the United States of America some of us are realising that we are on the verge of a national campaign to elect a new president, and the choice lies before us of becoming either isolationists and self-contained, or to become internationally-minded.

In the first event we would have to be prepared to write off through deflation a considerable part of our capital investment which has been built up to take care of this enormous production. We would have to further alter the occupations of millions of our citizens. We have too many farmers for one thing, if we are to be an isolated people, who during the process of adjustments would suffer intensely.

The other alternative is to adjust America to a commercial and political policy toward the restoration and stabilization of world economics. In other words, to go into the world picture even deeper than the United States has been in it before.

Recently Senator Borah advocated that we should liquidate the whole economic structure, amounting to something like fifteen billions of dollars, and get out of the picture completely. There is a considerable feeling, however, against internationalists across the line. That feeling expresses itself as it did in the decision of Congress not to continue the moratorium after next July; it expressed itself in high tariffs, in the order to completely shut out immigration, with the feeling "Let us get out momentarily; it is none of our business—let us get out and be clear." I am afraid that may be a popular slogan, that it captures the fancy of Main Street and Babbitry, but sooner or later our fellow citizens have to learn that that sort of preachment is demagogic and ruinous (Hear, hear.) (Applause.)

We are now a nation which must hold itself responsible for the economic and political stability of mankind.

Now, let me turn to Great Britain. It began the year with an experiment in protective tariffs after many generations of free trade. There is not any question but that the policy was adopted as an emergency measure, and I hope it will only remain emergent. (Applause.) In the interests of self-protection—and perhaps there was something of a retaliatory spirit involved—as I understand it, my friends, the tariffs are merely a matter of balancing exports and imports. Tariffs are fences which shut more out than they shut in. (Applause.) (Hear, hear.) We stand in need to-day of more international reconcilation and good will; we need to bring more than ever before the peoples of the world together, (Hear, hear), and the rearing of tariff walls by the countries of the world, one against the other, is the best way to break down whatever good will exists in the world to-day. (Applause.) It is the wrong thing. It is wrong morally, and I believe it is wrong economically.

What are we doing? Economics is no respecter of barriers and boundary lines. There must be a free exchange of the goods of the world; the nations of the world have begun to be specialists in the products of agriculture and manufactured goods. They need each other for free exchange. When England, following the lead of the other countries, set up a protectionist tariff policy, it did something which I think it will regret, because it will lead to reducing foreign buying of English goods after the first spell of inflated buying has passed. There will be a let-down to the buying, and the amputation of further industry. Under this policy, and if she continues it, she may find herself in a position to stabilize her pound sterling if she wishes to avoid further deficits, and the rise of prices will be a further handicap in that respect.

It seems to me in the economic demands, that the world is crying, firstly, for a humanization of the economic processes of life. I like that phrase "humanization" better than the phrase "socialization", because the latter seems to conjure up the bogie of Marx and Socialism, and what I am thinking about is that not any particular economic system is really a cure for our complex economic ills. Rather, I am thinking of the paralysis of those great moral principles which dictate that in a world where we can produce so abundantly, men shall build houses and they shall live in them, then shall plant the vinyards, and they shall sit under them, and not that they shall build and others shall live in them, not that they shall plant, and others shall reap of the harvest. (Applause.)

Gentlemen, the time has come when the great prophetic principles must be put into economics. The amazing thing to me, as I look at the people of the world, is the patience of the poor (hear, hear.) How long, how long, oh Lord, will these people remain patient? As President Butler put it: "Midgets are in the seats of the Mighty". The business leaders of the world, and of this continent in particular, seem to be caught up in a fantastic philosophy; they seem to feel that certain forces are working themselves out, over which they have no control. As a religious teacher, I refuse to bow to that conception of life. I have a feeling that is as deep as a God-given conviction, and I hope that there is in the human race sufficient intelligence to pull the world out of the sordidness into which we have dragged it, not as an act of God, but as the result of the stupidity and the greed of mankind. (Applause.)

In a practical way I think the time has come when nations of the world should convene an international convention to formulate all tariffs. Now, I know that every country holds its sovereignty dear; every country objects to having somebody else decide for it what it shall do, but in a world where all the people are in the same boat, no individual in that boat can bore a hole under his feet without filling the whole boat. (Applause.) So it seems to me that what we need is a great education for the business man, and in public things is where he needs it most. We need to eliminate the discriminatory tariffs; we need to remove conditions so that there can be a free and equal trade between all nations; we need also to stabilize in some way the dollar or the pound so that every man may use it as his own local yard-stick in measuring the value of the dollar and pound.

Of course, we know we need the criterion in regard to relativities; we have no foot rule, but let us forget metaphysics for a moment and get down and put our feet on the ground, and I think in that process of stabilizing the dollar or the pound, the English-speaking people of the world have a great contribution to make. (Applause.)

I turn now, my friends, to France. The attitude of the people of France in the world to-day and toward the world is exactly like the attitude which Germany adopted after 1870. After 1870, Germany put forth all her efforts to maintain the *status quo* established by the Treaty of Berlin; France is to-day doing everything in her power to insist that what was created by the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 must be upheld.

The Treaty of Versailles in 1919 gave France supremacy over Eastern Europe; it humiliated and broke Germany, and made France the great Imperial Power of the world to-day. Recently, in a declaration in Parliament, Premier Laval said that these three propositions had to be upheld—this was just prior to his going to Geneva—first, there must be the intricate and full payment of reparations; secondly, that peace treaties were sacred in Europe, and that no disarmament could take place until the nations of the world enter into a security pact to preserve inviolate the peace treaties.

Now the French plan at Geneva is amusing. On the face of it, it seems like a great confession. France has suggested that the League of Nations be removed, and France's interest in the League of Nations is only so far as the League of Nations will help to maintain the *status quo* in Europe.

If it needs to be that the League should be armed for that purpose, then France is willing that they should be armed.

France is not interested in the League of Nations, is not interested in the United States of Europe herself. Mr. Briand has advocated that, provided France can be the head of the United States of Europe. That is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. Simon, the English representative, gave an excellent answer to France's proposal at Geneva. You are familiar with it. France is to-day the disturber of the world's peace. Her theory is that Germany must be kept weak. The French say that the rule of life is always to want to be first, and France says quite naturally why not that? They say: "If we do not lead, someone will lead". France has never said to Europe, "Nobody shall be dominated, but all should co-operate". She always prates about peace, but always the sort of peace which maintains her hegemony over Europe. France will never feel secure until she is on the Rhine from the mouth of Flanders to the border in Switzerland, and as long as that continues there is no way for disarmament, and there is no hope for peace in Europe.

Now, let me turn to Germany.

The great menace which looms like a spectre over and above all of Europe is Adolf Hitler. Let us examine Hitler for a moment. He is no leader; has no personality of any magnitude, and Hitler and Hitlerism are expressed in the despair and disillusionment that bankrupt all of Germany and her people; those people, stolid and patient folk, who have borne the bit between their teeth for thirteen long years, and who can bear it no longer. (Hear, hear.) The alternatives, my friends in a country where a third of the people who are employed earn about $25.00 a month in our money, and who have about 8,000,000 unemployed in that country of 65,000,000—the alternatives in Germany, unless some miracle occurs, a miracle which will bring back everything stabilized to that country—as I say, the alternatives are Fascism or Communism.

Now, there are many people who say when Hitler gets into power, as he will; he can get into power any time he likes after this year—he controls over 50 per cent. of the voters in Germany—when Hitler gets into power, my friends, something will happen not only to Germany but to all of Europe. For one thing, let me suggest this; some of you think, "Well, it will go in the direction of Fascism; Italy did, and it was not so bad", But I want to remind you that what Hitler may do to Germany, or be to Germany what Korensky was to Russia. It took a Lenin to destroy the rule of Korensky. It may take a Lenin to destroy the works of Hitler, and when that happens then there is danger ahead for all of Europe. If Hitler gets into power, the first thing that I believe he will do will be to try and smash the Communists of Germany. There are 5,000,000 or more Communists in Germany; there are more Communists in Germany than there are in Russia. If Hitler goes after the Communists he will have to reckon with Moscow and the Russian Army, which has intimated that it will not look dispassionately upon any such move on Hitler's part. Moscow, in that event, will throw a bridge of steel across Poland, and march into Germany to defend the German Communists, and then the French will find themselves marching alongside of their enemy, Hitler. Central Europe would be devastated, and a conflict of that magnitude cannot be localized. It would be like a brush fire, gigantic armies would begin to march over the frontier, and it would flare up again, and Russia would try to regain Bessarabia from Poland; Poland would again have the frontier, and all the minority forces smouldering in Europe would awaken and Europe would have the greatest war it ever experienced.

It may interest you farther to learn that Hitler and his agents are in communication with the extreme nationalists of all countries, including France. Nationalism is the beast which is eating at the heart of Europe to-day. In this contact, Hitler and his party are endeavouring to build up a coalition between the Nationalist forces in all the countries of Europe, for the purpose of creating a Nationalist internationale, to combat the Red Internationale of Moscow, and the next war in Europe will be a war against Communism.

Hitler has not taken power yet, and if Hitler will wait until after next March to take power, it will be because the lines have not been completely drawn between Nationalistic Europe under Hitler's leadership.

My friends, the picture is menacing.

Now, may I say a word about Russia. Russia is celebrating the end of the five-year plan; it is now announcing its second five-year plan, and I believe, despite everything which comes out of Russia— and I do not want to minimize for a moment the great success which the first five-year plan has had, a success which was beyond even the expectations of those on the outside who have watched objectively—Russia suffered a real set-back in 1931, a set-back which expresses itself in terms of the fullest import, a depression which expresses itself in terms of the fact that Russia cannot get credit in Europe to buy machinery. During the last year under Stalin there was inaugurated an unequal wage system, which is a terrible blow, a worse blow than the note was to Communistic principles, and he is now dealing liberally with the anti-communistic intellgencia. But the most important part is that the second five-years is five years to promote the leading light industries instead of the heavy industries of Russia. "Light industries" means to promote the manufacture of those things which the people could not dream of before, such as shoes, clothing and items of food. But the chief aim of the Communists was to set up within the next twenty years a system of machinery touching the heavy industries which would be able to compete with the rest of the world.

Unless Communistic Russia can build itself up industrially to compete with Western Industrialism, then it has not succeeded. Of course, it needed prosperity in capitalistic Europe and America to do that, because the more prosperous capitalistic Europe and America are, the more money Russia could borrow, the more machinery she could get, the better exchange of exports in terms of machinery, money and personnel, and in 25 years this great machine would have been created which would have been the Nemesis of Western capitalism. I am not siding one way or the other; I am simply describing, Gentlemen, and it is my thought that the Lord intervened in something which human ingenuity could not have fathomed.

Then came this great depression, and Russia found herself unable to borrow American money in Germany for her machinery. That was a peculiar paradox. We did not recognize Russia. We loaned money to Germany. Germany built recreation centres and swimming pools and all sorts of public buildings, and with the excess funds she did business with Russia, and quite naturally and normally, and for the interest of industry throughout Europe. But our American money was building up Russia, while America could not directly, with governmental sanction, do the work which her money was doing indirectly.

Unless, however, there is an adjustment of the economic situation in the world, something will happen in Europe. It will happen in this way: if the economic conditions should grow worse there will be the menace of the class war, and communism will spread over Europe, as a protest to capitalism, which fails to give men bread and work. Remember that Communism came to Russia on the plea that it would give three things, peace, bread and work. Unless we can give the people of the world bread and work and peace, human beings the world over are all alike.

As for the central European countries, my friends, they are absolutely on the verge of bankruptcy, and I would not be surprised, unless there is a restoration of credit to Austria and Hungary, that we may find in Austria a reversion to primitive barter within the next year.

I want to say now, because my time is limited to five minutes at the most—I want to say a word about the war debt reparations.

I do not know how many of you remember reading—for many of you read but do not remember everything you read—this book by a great Englishman, and oh, there are some keen English thinkers in the world to-day, if the world would only listen to them. I wonder how many remember reading Keyne's book on "The Economic Consequences of Peace", written in 1919?

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to say that this man, thirteen or fourteen years ago, saw clearly and predicted what would happen, and how this man saw with the eye of a prophet! When you read this book, and re-read it, as I recommend you should—everyone—you will find Keynes seeing what everyone is beginning to see to-day. He said: "The extent of the Great War debt is a menace to financial stability everywhere. There is no European country"—he wrote in 1919—"in which reparations may not soon become an important political issue."

That is exactly what is happening in the world to-day. Keynes was a trained and skilled economist, and he foresam this thing; he foresaw the imposition of the new principle such as was never invoked before to take away from the vanquished nation everything you could lay hands on. To say that nations can pay up reparations within two years is an impossible fiction.

What is the trouble across the line? My people in the United States do not realize that the Humpty Dumpties of reparation war debts have tumbled everywhere, and all the king's horses and all the king's men will never put reparations and war debts back on the fences again. (Applause.)

The only question which now remains is how long it will take for the people in the United States and France —for the people of England seem to understand the difference—how long it will take for these people to comprehend that it is a more profitable arrangement for them to cancel and to liquidate the war debts, the intergovernmental war debts and the reparations, than it is to keep them; more profitable economically, for, when we wipe out those, then the United States will have the greatest markets of Europe it ever had. But, after all, what was the difference? We pay Germany and the other countries, and they buy our surplus. In 1918, we woke up and we stopped lending them further money, and they stopped buying from us, and we suffered from a depression. Is it not better to wipe it off and say "Yes, those will be wiped off, provided not a penny of that can go into the building of more war machinery. (Applause), instead of taking the position of being accused by the world of being the Shylock of the world, which is an unjust accusation, and as a citizen of the United States of America I resent that the world should think of our country in those terms. But we have put ourselves in the position where many vicious tongues can say those things about us. Has not the time come, however, for my country—and I state this across the line and say it continuously and feel it is fair to say it here—that we should take the moral as well as the economic leadership in those things, and to stabilize world economics. It will be a long time before we can do those things across the line without shocking the sensibilities of the men on the street who have been taught by politicians that these things could not happen, but who, when we have educated them, will follow instead of leading.

The time has come for those who are in politics, for the great mass of citizens, to bow to the universities and the press and the other moulders of public opinion, and coerce the leadership which the world requires. (Applause.) I say to you, gentlemen, I think that time has come.

Now I am afraid there are two tremendous subjects which I have left untouched, first, the great question of Geneva. I want to say just a word with your indulgence.

The real problem behind Geneva is not a financial problem, although that, too, is important, for, after all, the world cannot in these days be carrying a five billion dollar annual load for armaments. It is just impossible, and economically unsound, despite all that the soothsayers and the pessimists are saying.

I want to think optimistically about Geneva, for I think before that Conference is over we will come out of it with some reduction in armament, with a lateral cut in armament, and it will be for economic reasons, because after all, if we cut the cost of armaments ten or twenty per cent., but leave the ratio, all the powers would be politically secure, as secure as they were before, and all the powers understand that, and the real issue is not that at all. Gentlemen, the real issue behind the Geneva Conference is the Treaty of Versailles. As long as the Treaty of Versailles stands there can be no disarmament, because the whole situation is political.

Europe is divided into two groups, those who stand pat on the Treaty of Versailles, and those who stand against it. So long as France will not regard and recognize Germany as an equal in Europe, so long as France will build up that gold and that man-power, and the armaments of a vassal state, a hegemony of Europe, to maintain its position, so long will there be a threat of war, and as long as there is a threat of war there will be the need of armament in Europe.

What we need—what France needs—to learn particularly is this; that if she refuses to disarm it is plain that sooner or later Germany will re-arm, and then France will not be able to prevent that, because the rest of the nations of Europe will not support her in preventing it.

If, however, France agrees to disarm effectively under international control, then the fear complex would be broken. But I say to you, that that means that England and the United States must be in Geneva, and with more than their tongues in their cheeks. (Hear, hear.) I think it is really a pity that Lord Robert Cecil did not go as a delegate of his country to Geneva. (Applause.) There is a man who has not his tongue in his cheek, but we have gone on with our tongues in our cheeks. We are talking about naval parity with Great Britain, and I was reminded of Norman Angel, the author of a great book in 1910, called "The Great Illusion", and you should read it, because he, too, saw prophetically the outbreak of the war, and he recommended to his people that to square the situation about naval parity it would be a good thing to trade a few of their dreadnaughts in the United States. There would be no need to build new navies in the United States, and there would be parity all around. (Laughter.) But we need to see that so long as France insists on formulating or putting security before cooperation and disarmaments, there can be no peace.

The United States is not going to sign on the dotted line to guarantee to France that in the event of an upset in Europe we are going over and maintain her frontiers and her hegemony. Neither is England going to sign on the dotted line a promise that she would come over, and France must not take the position of coming over and saying, "Until you sign on the dotted line we will build up the biggest army in Europe, and maintain the Treaty of Versailles".

The time has come for the world to understand the need of revising that whole treaty, and I am reminded of one member of the Cambridge Debating Team, whom I once heard in Toronto, who said with effectiveness: "The Treaty of Versailles was not a treaty to end war, but it was a treaty which ended our peace". (Hear, hear.)

And we have not yet awakened to that realization.

And now, the last to which I wish to refer briefly is the Sino-Japanese situation, which presents another interesting picture upon which I will say just a word, and then I will be through. Many people imagine that the war which is being carried on, it seems now to a finish, is a war for territorial aggrandizement. Nothing is really further from the truth, for, after all, China can afford to lose Manchuria and still be a great power and a great country. The Japanese are not a colonizing people; there are actually no more than a little over 200,000 real Japanese, not counting the Koreans, in Manchuria, coming in there in the past 25 years. The Japanese are not a colonzing people. They are seeking more territory for an over-populated country, and what Japan is seeking is something entirely within her country. Japan is seeking supremacy in the far East, seeking an economic hegemony over the far East. What Japan wants is to draw a yellow line around the yellow races of the far East, to sit in control, the way France sits in control of Eastern Europe.

When you look at it from a Japanese point-of-view you see the thing a little more sympathetically. Here is Japan; for 60 years they have been building up a machine, and they are to-day one of the great industrial competitors of Germany, of England, and of the United States in the World. Here is China, with 400,000,000 people, a great chaotic agricultural country. Japan is the machine country. There is a natural affinity economically, therefore, between the two countries.

Furthermore, there is a racial and a sort of cultural relationship between the two people, and what Japan is saying, not in so many words, but anyone who studies can understand, that what they want is to keep out of the far East the influences of the West. They want to get England and France and Italy and the United States and Germany and Russia out of the economic competition, and furthermore they want to create and maintain for Japan a supremacy which will go to the point some day of leading the yellow races of the world, which once were the greatest leaders of mankind, back again into leadership. You must understand the long-range view of this thing. Once before the Japanese and the Chinese and the yellow races led. Then the supremacy moved from the East to the West, and as we look into the picture I ask myself, "May not destiny be moving in the direction of the East again"?

The Japanese are thinking not only in political terms but in economic terms, and they are thinking in terms of world supremacy (Hear, hear.)

Gentlemen, perhaps that should be said with bated breath, but it ought to be said, and we ought to face the long-range view of the world's situation.

What we should do in the meantime I think we are doing; I think it is an excellent thing, and though I happen to be one of those who do not believe in force, the situation has become so complex in the far East—and Japan is no longer the "bad boy" of the League; she has become the "outlaw of the world"—(Applause), and under such circumstances, although I loathe the idea of ever using force in the far East, I think it is an excellent thing, as matters stand, to face the reality, and that there should be by France, England and the United States a display of force. (Applause.)

Without wanting in any sense to be eulogistic, or to appear too realistic in my views, I cannot think in terms of the principle that having been slapped on one cheek in this particular situation, the world needs to give the other. Before giving the other, I think Japan ought to be spoken to and in terms which she understands, and in the presence of dreadnaughts—not the use of them, but the presence of dreadnaughts, which will be a great deterrent force to Japan. Consequently, I believe that if conditions continue—and I do not seem to see them mitigating—England, France, Germany and the United States ought to withdraw her citizens and her nationalists from the scene of action into a protected neutral zone. (Applause.) I think we ought not to wait any longer.

I am afraid of some national of these countries getting in the way of a Japanese or Chinese bullet, and we all know how hysterical men can become when it involves the citizens of her own country in foreign lands, and in the tense conditions under which we are living, it may mean war. However, gentlemen, I am in favour as a last resort of the use of the economic boycott. (Applause.) That may mean, as some people say, something worse than war, but I am in favour of subsidizing dollars for human lives. Always before, the flag followed the dollar; now, let the dollar precede the flag as a substitute for men and women.

What is the outlook, my friends? Is there not hope for the world? We must find a way out of this famine in the midst of plenty. We must have humanized economics to take the place of our present economic system; we must have enthusiasm take the place of the aggressive nationalism with its excess of armaments, of tariffs, and so forth; the Treaty of Versailles must give way, and I believe there is enough human ingenuity in the world, if the whole of the race will lend itself, to find the way out. We are a generation in the wilderness, we have the choice, we can either die in the wilderness, as Spengler predicts we will, or we can find the way out to the Promised Land. I believe, I have hope, I have faith, that as we go into the new era mankind will find a way out, and that our children may grow up in a millennium of life which will give them an opportunity for life, for liberty, and for the pursuit of happiness.

I thank you sincerely for your attention. (Prolonged applause.)

THE FUTURE OF THE LEGITIMATE THEATRE

AN ADDRESS BY MR. MAURICE COLBOURNE.

Thursday, February 18, 1932

LIEUT-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker, and welcomed the members of his Company.

MR. COLBOURNE: After expressing sincere regrets on behalf of Mr. Sherwood, who was unable to be present on account of illness, he remarked that Mr. Sherwood seemed to have solved in his own person all the problems which confronted not only the British Empire but the entire English-speaking world, for in spite of the fact that he was an American of Scottish and Irish ancestry and fought with the Canadian forces in the War and visited England whenever he could, and loved it, yet he seemed to be at supreme peace with himself and incidentally a very successful person (Applause). He is suffering, the speaker continued, from a bout of 'flu, but he is not alone in his suffering, for Mr. Barry Jones and myself, together with those of our company who are here today are also suffering—from an excess of Toronto hospitality gloriously experienced last night even into the early hours of this morning. (Laughter.)

We thank the audience today for their reception of us, and we also thank the press, not only of Toronto but also of Eastern Canada, for we feel that the immediate future of the legitimate theatre is intimately dependent upon the press. In the present instance our only fear was that neither ourselves nor our company nor our play could possibly live up to the royal reception provided for us by the press in advance, and that we should be bringing to Canada at least a couple of Drury Lane *Caval-*

cades. (Laughter.)

The subject of my address—The Future of the Legitimate Theatre—is perhaps one of the most difficult on which I could be asked to speak, since it is so easy to talk an infinite amount of claptrap about the theatre and especially about its future. How can any of us know anything worth knowing about the future of the theatre, legitimate or otherwise? If we could, nothing would be simpler than to lay our plans accordingly and rapidly become millionaires.

There are always so many lugubrious Jeremiahs in this business, as in every other, that perhaps it will be as well to try and dispose of some of them first. These will say that THE THEATRE IS GOING TO THE DOGS! Well, I always feel that much the best way to deal with that well-worn statement is to agree heartily and say "Yes, the theatre is going to the dogs", and then to follow up the agreement with the equally truthful statement that it has been going to the dogs steadily for at least 2,000 years, but has never reached them yet. (Laughter.)

I suppose in the old days of the Greek theatre when, say, *Oedipus Rex* was produced for the first time, there were people sitting in the open-air orchestra stalls who declared that the topic of the play was a disgraceful one to be offered for public consumption, and who went straight home and wrote a strong letter to the local papyrus pointing out that the production of such immoral plays was a clear indication that the theatre was going to the dogs. And so on, through all the theatre's ages and stages, it has been going to the dogs. I will indulge in one more instance. When the element of comedy entered into the miracle and mystery plays of mediaeval times (if I remember rightly the first comic character to be introduced by the playwright was one of the shepherds who watched their flocks by night; his name was Mak, and he was made not only a comic but a sheep-stealer into the bargain)—I feel fairly sure the local padre went to the producer of the play, which was always enacted inside the churches themselves, and said, "Look here, we simply will not have this sort of thing; either you cut out this so-called funny stuff or else you take yourself and your frivolous players outside the sacred precincts of this church." So, because the element of comedy refused to be smothered, they left the churches and played to excellent business in the market-places just round the corner. Then, no doubt, a burning correspondence was carried on in the Parish Magazine to prove that the theatre was doomed and had already reached the dogs. Well, they were wrong, and I think these Jeremiahs will always be wrong.

Now, gentlemen, I want to avoid claptrap and get right down to brass tacks. I therefore submit to you a magnificent slogan for the professional theatre of any age, one coined by Sir Henry Irving, who said, "The theatre that does not pay is dead". I thing those words should be emblazoned on the portals of every theatre and be carried in the forefront of the mind of anyone who presumes to be associated with the Theatre in a managerial way. The theatre should pay. I am all against theatres supported by the State, whether by endowment or subsidy. Even the famous *Comedie Francaise* for some years has been in a moribund condition, and I suspect that the intended English National Theatre will remain a permanent argument instead of a concrete fact, because the English at the back of their minds always seem to muddle through, as the phrase goes, and do the wise thing; and I feel they have refrained for so many years from building a national theatre, in spite of continuous efforts to build one, because they see that it too would shortly become what I only call a moribund mess. In New York they actually built the Century Theatre (which in many of its essentials approximated a national theatre), and I see that it is now satisfactorily pulled down and defunct.

The next question we have to ask is, IS the theatre paying? Well, I do not think it is, as a whole. I think the theatre is in a very critical and dangerous state. One reflection of this state is the fact that the greatest individual firm which the world has seen in the theatrical business—the legitimate stage—went bankrupt a few months ago in New York. One of the troubles in London, on the other hand, is, I think, that the theatre is over-theatred. This is not so much because we have built so many new theatres as because we have an innate horror of pulling anything down; with the consequence that at the slightest provocation, at Christmas time, for example, not only are all the regular and new theatres open, but there is a rush to resurrect and re-open all the old ones, with both old and new giving perhaps four extra matinees a week; with the obvious further consequence that there are not enough audiences to go round.

In saying that the theatre does not pay today I have in mind particularly the average London theatre, because it especially is behind the times and behind its competitors—by which I mean of course the gargantuan palazzos of the cinema. The ostentatious luxury of these places may be a good thing, a bad thing, or an indifferent thing, according to your moral philosophy and views upon the virtues, if any, of comfort and leisure; but the fact remains that this is an age of creature comforts and mass production; of, that is, a flood of low-priced goods of mediocre quality; and the London theatres are still proceeding on the old basis of delivering exclusive and exquisite goods in small quantities to the aristocratic and the few.

I think part of the problem comes down to the need for cheaper seats. Here in Toronto, with its cheap matinees, I would call theatre prices okay. If you grant this, let us compare the London prices. I suppose the cost of commodities in general in England is about half of what it is on this side of the Atlantic, so that the cost of an orchestra stall over there ought to be about half what it is here, but its actual cost in London is, as you know, at least ten shillings and six, which is roughly $2.50, or in other words twice too much, compared to other commodities. If orchestra stalls in London were sold at a fashionable price of five shillings or seven shillings and sixpence there would be a chance of the London theatres filling themselves—a feat not being accomplished this season.

Of course London is very conservative—which is a great thing, no doubt, because it is that spirit that has kept the Old Country from all sorts of unpleasant excitements in the past. But equally it keeps us from doing a few fairly pleasant and necessary things in the present. In the theatre, for instance, if we ever have the doubtful fortune to own one in London, one of the first things we would do to improve it and make it possible to make it pay would be to see that our patrons were able to receive a programme of the play and to park their hats and coats, for nothing. (Laughter.) If you suggest this to a Londoner the answer is likely to be, "Oh, be careful; people *like* to pay for their programmes; if you give them away for nothing they will think it is a rotten show."

Another thing we would take from this side (where we have learnt so much) would be what I call Bargain Matinees, such as we had the pleasure of giving yesterday. These are tremendous incentives to attendance, and I believe people, especially the ladies, feel they are at a sort of January clearance sale. (Laughter.) Again, when we suggested that this should be tried in London, they said, "Oh, but be very careful; if you charge less for one of your matinees people will think there is something wrong with it and conclude that all the understudies will be taking part."

Well, we have to get over all kinds of little things like this in London before it can be said to have put its theatrical house in order. To-day there are dozens of other little prejudices and customs that are making the theatre less and less palatable to the theatre-going public. For instance, we may call this the age of the artificial silk stocking. By this I mean that when a young fellow wants to take his girl out in the evening to an entertainment—let it be a theatre or a cinema or whatever else is going on—and he cannot afford two orchestra stalls, he will hesitate a good deal before risking letting himself down in the eyes of his girl by taking her into a theatre by what in England is literally a back door; which is what he has to do if he takes her into the pit or gallery, the only places where he can get cheap enough seats. But in all rival places of entertainment he can make for the cheapest seat in the house through the main door, and be escorted to it in the best style completely surrounded by powdered flunkeys. (Laughter.)

Well, suppose the theatre does put its house in order and brings itself up to date in the matter of comfortable seats and cheap prices and all else, upon what does its future depend? It depends, I think, upon four main things.

One, of course, is the author, the playwright. Where are the playwrights to succeed the older generation—the Galsworthys and the Barries and the Shaws and the Somerset Maughams? Well, there is always one answer: some of them lie in Flanders' fields and some in other fields, farther-flung. What are those immortal lines?

It dawns in Asia; tombstones show,
And Shropshire names are read;
And the Nile spills its overflow
Beside the Severn's dead.

Out of the million English slain there would surely have been a playwright or two. As to those of the Lost Generation who did not perish and who are writing plays to-day, I think they will find themselves falling, as playwrights, into one of four categories. There are the realists, intent on depicting the disillusionment of the times. Contrarily, there are those who want to get away from the grim uncertainties and troubling questions of the present generation, escapists, who will seek refuge in comedy and farce and romance as far removed as possible from the disillusionment of the realists. Thirdly, there will aways be the propagandists, like our old friend G. B. S. And fourthly, there will be that best of all playwrights, the playwright who writes to please himself.

We have two splendid examples to-day of this kind of playwright, one on each side of the Atlantic—Noel Coward and our friend upstairs, whose play *Re-union in Vienna* is one of the very few big successes now running in New York. Certainly Noel Coward writes to please himself; otherwise he would not have written *Post Mortem,* a play that stands only the slightest chance of immediate production, especially since the public has not been taught to expect that kind of play from Noel Coward.

Robert Sherwood I know writes to please himself, because it was only yesterday that I heard—if I may trespass on the play now appearing in Toronto—how he came to write *The Queen's Husband.* He wrote it in much the same way that A. A. Milne wrote his play, *Wurzel-Flummery.* When Milne was serving in the War he was very late on parade one day—not a unique occurence, for he admits to being a very unsoldierly soldier—and as he ran on to the barrack square buttoning up his tunic, he suddenly thought of the words Wurzel-Flummery. During parade they bored their way into his brain until finally, to get rid of them, he wrote a play round them. In the same way, apparently, the thought of a line came to Robert Sherwood. The line was, "Yes, that is the worst of these revolutionists; they are always such rotten shots." That line was the genesis of *The Queen's Husband,* and in the completed manuscript was due to end the second Act and to be spoken by King Eric VIII. as he stepped out on to the balcony. Well, to show the curious way these things happen, that line was one of the first to be cut out at rehearsal. (Laughter.)

Then of course, secondly, we have to have actors. Now, here is an interesting point, and I submit the question to you, Where to-day can we look for the successors of those players whose names have been household words for years past, players such as that great actress who, to the grief of us all, passed away but a few days ago—Mrs. Fiske? Where are their successors?

For to-day there is a cause at work which utterly prevents the training, and largely the tradition, on which those great artists were brought up.

I suppose most of the best British actors of to-day, like my friend at this table, Mr. Barry Jones (Applause) are Old Bensonians. Now, it was the invariable routine and pleasure of the Benson Company to put you in your place; that is, you were given a spear and told to walk on for a couple of years; and very glad you were to do it, round the provinces, across the Atlantic, in South Africa, in Australia, everywhere—walking on, understudying, holding spears, watching and waiting, absorbing tradition and discipline.

But what happens to-day? You engage a beautful girl with obvious talent at the outset of her career, and hope to train her in the best traditions of the stage. On the third day of her engagement, for which she is drawing the proper salary of two to three pounds a week—proper, that is, for a beginner—she comes to you and says, "I had a telephone call from a film company this morning; I went out to see them and I was offered a hundred pounds a week to make a film for them. May I accept?" Well, if you say No, you make her discontented for the rest of her engagement with you. If you say Yes, she is caught by the films and will remain caught for as long as they pay her a sufficiently tempting salary. One cannot blame her; indeed Barry Jones and I are peculiarly sympathetic towards people in her boat, for both he and I found it utterly impossible to refuse the sums of money held out to us to persuade us to film by day while we were acting by night. It is not a question of sympathy, however, so much as how is it possible under such conditions to establish a training ground or a tradition or a discipline for the stage, or even to persuade young artists that the stage is a profession, and a whole-time and arduous one at that. Too often to-day the stage is regarded as an incident that intervenes after a long day at the studio and before the small hours at a party.

Miss Grace Lane, our queen in *The Queen's Husband,* told me the other day that in Dame Madge Kendall's Company once you were in your stage clothes you were not allowed to sit down. A little mat was provided in the wings duly labeled with the name of the character you were playing, and on that two by three mat you stood until you made your entrance. By comparison with this sort of thing discipline is simply non-existent in the film studio, for all its early hours. There, the magnitude of a star can easily be judged by observing how late he or she dare arrive on the set; the later, the more important. (Laughter.)

Thirdly, there is the audience. This is such a subtle and important factor that it merits an address to itself, and I shall say nothing now except to point to the obvious fact that the presence of an audience at all implies the presence in its pockets of sufficient purchasing power to buy its seats. There were few things more tragic in England this winter than the nightmare dilemma in which the population was placed by being told, on the one hand, to save in order to Balance the Budget, and on the other, to spend in order to set the wheels of industry going round again. (Laughter.)

And fourthly, there is the press. Relations between the theatre and the press become more important daily; this is simply because the urgency of advertising grows daily, a statement true not only of the theatre but of every commodity. In England, unfortunately, the press as a whole is not interested in the theatre as a whole. Consequently advertising rates are high, and individual theatres are able to pay for only snippets of space. The further result of this is that the amount of free space accorded to news and gossip of the theatre is proportionately small. On the other hand, the press is intensely interested in the cinema, some of the press magnates either owning or controlling some of the cinema palazzos. In addition to this personal business interest, the press becomes automatically interested in any industry which buys not daily columns but daily pages of advertising space, and it is absurd to suggest that the cinema, with its power in the press and its low prices, is not making colossal captures among the audiences of the theatre.

These wholesale and continuous captures by the cinema would matter little if there was an inexhaustible reserve of people with money who were bent on being entertained and who would fill up the theatre's gaps. But there aren't and a shilling spent in a cinema means four times out of five five shillings lost to the theatre. I met someone lately who had examined the weekly sheet of one of the largest London cinemas. The takings were £8,000, a colossal sum for any legitimate theatre. But for the cinema it was apparently a bad week because the balance shown was—£30! Well, that just shows how much the cinema can and apparently must spend in advertising to bring the public in, and gives an idea of its weekly overhead costs. What interests me, however, is the literally concrete fact of about twenty such cinemas in London, equally gargantuan and magnificent. Now, if we do a little mathematical sum with these twenty alone, quite apart from the hundreds of smaller London cinemas, we find a sum of well over half a million dollars flowing week by week into the cinema. My contention is that enough of this very considerable sum, enough to make all the difference between reasonable prosperity and acute anxiety, would have flowed into the theatre if the cinema had not been next door underselling it. For I do not think that most people have either the desire or the time or money for both. But this is by the way.

The press, on the rare occasions when it wants to help a play, sometimes oversteps the mark and kills the play with kindness. There was the case of the actor-manager who was on fairly intimate terms with one of the great newspaper magnates. What happened was this. The wife of the magnate went to the play and finding the theatre only half full she told her husband and persuaded him to see the play for himself. The magnate went and after the first act went backstage and told the actor-manager not to worry. He said, "It's a good play, and I will see that the public comes to it". Accordingly, on reaching his office he issued a sort of Napoleonic order that until further notice every organ under his control should carry an article, every morning, every evening, on the merits of the play. Unfortunately, the great man had more important things to think about and quite forgot to countermand the order after it had had its desired effect, and himself dying shortly afterwards, the articles went on appearing until their surfeit killed the play, for the public began to think that a play needing such boosting must be a very poor one. (Laughter.)

Let us suppose, however, that all goes well; that the theatre puts its house in order in a material way, and attracts and trains and keeps the best playwrights and artists, that audiences have the desire and find the purchasing power to attend, and the press is interested in the theatre to the point of kindness without overdoing it, what, if anything, has the theatre of the future to fear? Well, I think it has to fear the perfection of its present competitors: talkies; television; radio; and it has to fear and keep an eye open for further mechanicalities at present undreamed of, and to remember that mechanism brought to bear on the arts spells mass production of the arts, and the consequent ability to deliver the commodity called Entertainment at a progressively lower cost. Let the theatre fear and face these things honestly, because the more it fears them the greater its inducement will be to put its house in order and deliver its goods.

I think the permanent outlook is good. This opinion is not just blind faith with the wish father to the thought, but is based on a simple fact. Indeed, this fact is so simple that as yet it has no recognized name. I submit to you a tentative name and call it Spiritual Electricity. Now this, as we on the stage know, is a very real thing. It is the thing that makes plays and breaks plays, is the cause of stage fright and first nightitis, and enables an audience to cheer or boo or cry or laugh as one man. The subtle current of it welds an audience into a unit. Now, I do not believe that this spiritual electricity can flow between two substances unless both of them are made of flesh and blood. (Applause.) It cannot flow therefore between two substances where one is composed of an inanimate area of canvas on which are projected in vary rapid succession the shadows of negative photographs. Neither can it flow between the tubes and batteries of an inanimate radio set and the listener-in. Indeed, the radio, although it has mighty advantages in convenience, cheapness and geographical scope, suffers two disadvantages compared with the cinema and three compared with the theatre; not only does no spiritual electricity flow, and not only does one see nothing, but one is rather lonely, for man is a gregarious animal by nature, and, especially when he wants to be entertained, seeks and enjoys the company of his fellows. As with the cinema and radio so with the rest of the theatre's mechanical competitors, present and future, until by a process of elimination we find that the theatre survives in the world of entertainment as the only form in which that all-important spiritual electricity can function and flow naturally and as a permanent and integral part of its being.

Lastly, I like to think of the theatre as a place in which men and women of differing opinions and different ways of living can meet and find a common touch. There the Conservative can sit side by side with the Liberal, the Roman Catholic side by side with the Protestant (Hear, hear), the poor man—well, if not side by side, yet in the same building with the rich man (Laughter), and together dip into the common bowl of spiritual refreshment, and be at peace.

I see that my time, unfortunately for me, is up. I hope I have been able in some measure to eschew uttering the claptrap of the theatre, and I hope you have not minded coming down to earth with me. The subject of the theatre is a difficult one for me since it is the subject of our own anxious daily cares. One has to be careful to avoid treating it as dirty linen and washing it in public. I hope therefore that in the last half hour I have not in any material way torn any holes for you in the veil of that illusion that is the life-blood of the theatre.

Before I sit down I am once again going to express to you the great thanks of my mute colleague, Barry Jones, whom I hope one day to persuade to make a speech, and of the members of our Company and of myself, for the honour of your invitation to us to be with you to-day; and if I may end on the same practical note that I have tried to sound all through, we especially thank you for helping our theatrical efforts—they are your theatrical efforts too—in Toronto and Canada generally, TO PAY! I thank you. (Loud applause.)

THE PRESIDENT conveyed the hearty thanks of the Club to the speaker for his interesting address.

MUSSOLINI AND THE NEW ITALY

AN ADDRESS BY DR. WILLIAM SHERWOOD FOX, B.A., M.A., PH.D., LL.D., F.R.S.C.

Thursday, February 25, 1932

MR. DANA PORTER, Vice-President, introduced the speaker.

DR. FOX: In referring to the chairman's flattering introductory remarks he expressed the fear that it would not fully meet the description. He felt much like the speaker who was introduced by the pastor of a colored church, and who was to preach an anniversary sermon. The visitor was introduced in words like these:—"This man who is brought to you to-day knows the unknown; he can think the unthinkable; and can unscrew the inscrutable." (Laughter.) He thanked the Chairman for his complimentary remarks concerning the University of Western Ontario, which was making its own contribution to Canadian higher education and Canadian life and citizenship in general, and in utmost harmony with the other Universities, nothwithstanding statements regarding friction.

Doctor Fox continued:—

My first word is to ask you to approach the topic of this address with the attitude of students, not with the attitude of those who are already in the frame of mind to censure or commend. I even venture to hope that you will accept as a brief statement of our aim a parody upon the well-known words of a great Italian of ancient times: "We come to study Mussolini, not to praise him." (Laughter.)

The policy of the modern historian is to endeavor to discover, if possible, the real as opposed to the traditional great men of history; to find, for instance, the real

Napoleon, the real Bismarck, the real Gladstone. Professor Gildersleeve, of John Hopkins, my old master, a great Southerner and an intense American patriot, used to say by way of epigram: "There are two George Washingtons; George Washington, the Father of his Country, and George Washington, the profane Virginia ability, is actually two persons, if not many more: at least a *glimpse* of the *real* Benito Mussolini, who, in all probability, is actually two persons, if not many more: at least, there is Mussolini, the butt of the columnists' ridicule, and Mussolini, the child of an obscure Italian hamlet and the Remaker of Italy.

If we are to believe the "funny man of the colyum," Mussolini is a "regular divil." Out of curiosity I have made a little collection of columnists' jibes which illustrate popular opinion of Mussolini outside of Italy. Here are a few samples.

"Mussolini lets only married men emigrate. He likes to keep those who recognize no thumb but his." (Laughter.)

"The ruins of a Roman forum have been unearthed in London, and first thing those Britishers know Mussolini will be claiming their capital as an Italian city."

"The probable reason why Rome wasn't built in a day is that Benito Mussolini wasn't there at the time." (Laughter.)

"If Mussolini should pass on his mantle to (the poet) D'Annunzio, Italy would simply be going from bad to verse." (Laughter.)

"Mussolin's one regret these days is that there isn't another Mussolini he can slap in the face." (Laughter.)

"Probably they call him 'Muss' in the Rotary Club of Rome,—(Laughter)—and, the way he is trying to start one in Europe, it sounds appropriate."

Last of all:

"Oh, Italy, we love your art,
Your songs have truly touched each heart.
But when a warlike fist you shake,
We sigh, 'Please sing, for heaven's sake.'" (Laughter.)

The really funny thing about these jokes is that they are nothing but permutations and combinations of one and the same joke, namely, that Mussolini is a fool, a whole fool and nothing but a fool, who lives in the fool's paradise of his own egotism and entertains no thought that there may possibly be a great democratic day of judgment. It behooves us as honest citizens of the world to ascertain just what manner of man this Mussolini is. As every man's present cannot be explained without a knowledge of his past, we must, for a few minutes, thumb over the pages of Mussolini's history, but not until we have got a vision of the Old Italy out of which Mussolini has evolved and which, through his evolution, he has made over.

The chief fact that the student of the modern Italy must keep before him is that Italy the nation never existed until 1870. Before that date, Italy was no more than a geographical title—the name of a peninsula. In 1870, the union of a number of petty kingdoms, principalities and duchies under the Royal House of Savoy created the Kingdom of Italy. So even the Old Italy of Mussolini's boyhood was after all only a Young Italy.

As a kingdom Italy begun her life encumbered by a bundle of burdens—a meagre accumulation of capital, a lack of a variety of natural resources, a shortage of technical skill, a deficiency of machinery, railways and ships, an appalling percentage of illiteracy, a surplus of dialects that divided the country, and, by no means least, a paralysing inferiority complex. But over against these liabilities she had two most valuable assets—an abundance of labor and a high degree of native intelligence.

The consciousness of nationhood gave her a new will and she set to work with zest to remove or reduce her burdens. The results were marvellous. By 1907, an illiteracy of 70 per cent. was reduced to 37 per cent. and the death rate from 30 per thousand to 16. The development of hydro-electric power on a large scale greatly reduced her imports of coal from abroad. Vast industrial centres were built up in the north, in such cities as

Turin and Milan. Prosperity increased amazingly. However, strange to say it was the other nations and not Italy herself that realized her rapid progress and for that reason, while the other burdens were gradually lifted, the inferiority complex remained. This accounts for the hold that Marxian doctrine very early secured in Italy.

It was not until the Kingdom was nearly forty years old that this hampering complex began to disappear, and after that it went quickly. The enthusiasm of the Italian conquest of Tripoli in 1911 marked the completion of the change, and with it was born the national idealism that we now see and feel in Italy. This it is that brought the young men of the country into leadership in politicis, manufacturing and commerce. This is the foundation upon which Fascism rests. Says a recent writer: "There can be no doubt of the youthful swagger of the new Italy. Entering it from France, you feel that you have suddenly entered a world full of young men." And I may add that there is no better illustration of this statement than my personal acquaintance, the new Grand Secretary of the Fascist Party, Achille Starace. When I met him he was the General of all the Fascist militia, 300,000 strong; he was still under thirty, and proudly called himself by his popular title—The Boy General.

In order to make the background of our study complete there are two other details we dare not omit. One is the supreme importance of the Mediterranean to Italy. Over the barrier of mountains behind her only a few exports and imports can move; indeed the railway traffic is not to be compared to the sea-borne tariffs. The Mediterranean is to her at once breath, food, fuel, clothing and highway. While Britain holds Gibraltar, Malta and the Suez Canal; while Turkey stands watch over the Dardanelles, and while France frowns, be it ever so kindly, with ships and forts over Italy's western frontier, do you wonder that Italy is sensitive and often irritable?

The other detail is an inexorable fact of arithmetic. The Italian people, even without Mussolini's encourage-ment, are multiplying and replenishing the earth at an enormous rate. The increase in population is 400,000 a year. Italy is a small country and is almost filled. Where will this excess population go? At the most Tripoli can hold only 400,000 in all—just one year's production. The North American quota has closed the Western gates. Practically only Brazil and the Argentine remain, but obviously the great problem of transportation involved is insoluble even if all the 400,000 wished to go to these countries—which they do not. Some day Italy's question—What shall we do with this surplus population?—will have to be answered. She cannot answer it alone. Grave danger lies in the inevitable prospect that other nations must help her find the answer.

Against this background let us project the portrait of Mussolini. Benito Mussolini was born in a hamlet of the mountainous Romagna, south of Bologna. The people of the district are by nature a tribe of agitators and were among the earliest Socialists of Italy. Benito's father, a blacksmith and inn-keeper by trade, was imprisoned for his part in the first Socialist disturbances in the eighties. In contrast, his mother was a calm and discreet, though energetic woman; the fact that she was schoolmistress of the village accounts for the son's good initial education and for his unconquerable desire for intellectual development. The strong impress made upon him by both parents is what makes Mussoini unique among champions of the proletariat; though like his father a vehement agitator, like his mother he does his thinking upon a uniformly high plane and expresses himself lucidly and forcefully.

That "the child is father of the man" is literally true in Mussolini's case. He says of himself that he was a restless and pugnacious boy. He struck quickly, often hard, and gave and took many a black eye, as though forecasting his later political career. As a boy he would not endure bullying, and now as the Premier of Italy he allows no other nation even to *seem* to bully his country. He knew no fear except that of perfidy and treachery, but was always ready to pardon those who had offended him, provided they showed signs of penitence. One of his close political associates has told me that even to his enemies he is too generous, and very often he has offended the extreme Fascists by his refusals to countenance reprisals.

Besides his father and mother there were other strong formative influences cast about his years of boyhood and youth: among books, Victor Hugo's *Les Miserables,* Macchiavelli's political writings, and will you believe it?—the writings of Julius Caesar; among people, Professor Vilfredo Pareto of the University of Geneva.

It is often said that Mussolini is uneducated. That is quite untrue in both senses of the word. After leaving his mother's village school he attended a church college in Faenza, then a teacher's institute and later on taught school. Naturally, an ordinary village school-board could not understand so stirring a personage as he was, and he was therefore summarily dismissed from his post. He then turned to Switzerland, the haven of political agitators, and attended in succession the Universities of Lausanne, Geneva and Zurich, picking up a meagre living by doing all sorts of odd jobs, and sometimes almost starving. Wherever he went he associated with the radicals and, of course, drew the attention of the political authorities upon him. Banished from Lausanne, he went to Geneva; banished from Geneva he went to Zurich; banished from Zurich he went back to Italy, a prisoner in chains.

It is said that "a rolling stone gathers no moss." Mussolini is an exception to the rule, for in Switzerland the teachings of Pareto, the economist, struck to him permanently. From Pareto he acquired a certain manner of political thinking, a manner based upon what Pareto termed "the theory of the imponderable." "Pareto, when, after exhaustive experiment and study, he had arrived at a conclusion, regarded this conclusion not as indubitable and final, but merely as provisional and to be used tentatively as a basis for further enquiry." No doubt this accounts for Mussolini's apparent shiftiness of policy. The fact is that he thinks a thousand times quicker than the rest of us. Despite an otherwise active life Mussolini found time in Switzerland to learn French thoroughly and to acquire a working knowledge of English, German and Spanish.

But the end of his education was not yet. Back to school-teaching he went, but he was no sooner in his job than he was out again, a conservative school-board once more objecting to his political independence and to his soap-box oratory. But even then he was learning something, for during this period he secured private tutoring in Greek and Latin from a priest. His next step was to become a Professor of French in a private college, but apparently, in a moment of professorial absent-mindedness, he led the peasants of the district in a strike, and lost his job accordingly. (Laughter.)

Life is often compared to a game of chess. Mussolini's life, however, is more like a hockey-game where the moves are like lightning. Next we find him in Austria; and a very significant move it was for him, for there he took a position as Secretary of the Socialists of the Trentino, that southeastern corner of Austria as it then was—inhabited by a large population of "unredeemed Italians", as they were called before the War. His sojourn here explains his attitude and outbreak toward Germany.

Returning to Italy, Mussolini began his career as Editor of Socialist journals—The Class Struggle; The *Avanti* (or Forward, the chief organ of the Italian Socialists); of a weekly, *Utopia;* and, after resigning from the *Avanti,* of his own paper, *Il Popolo d'Italia* (The Italian People). Judging by this long list one might easily infer that, in common phrase, he was "some Socialist". On the contrary, the Socialists never felt he was really one of them, and at the same time he was unacceptable to the Conservatives. In fact, socially and politically, he was neither fish, flesh, nor fowl. Though he called himself a Socialist, and vigorously championed the cause of the proletariat, he refused to accept Marx's materialism and anticapitalistic economics. From the outset he stood for education and culture as the natural right of the common people. He was never content to recite current Socialistic creeds and formulas as though they were a final gospel, but always claimed the right to think his way beyond them and thus make progress. Unlike the average Socialist, he would not condemn *all* war, and he actually advocated Italy's campaign in North Africa in 1911. No wonder he was anathema to the typical international Socialist.

His changing attitude toward the Great War reveals his character better than does anything else. Before Germany invaded Belgium he openly demanded absolute neutrality on the part of Italy, under the threat of a rebellion of the proletariat. He had his way. Curiously, very soon afterward we find him commending the Socialists of Belgium for arming against Germany. In September he was ready to think of "a relative neutrality" as the duty of Italy. Before long, he declared himself in favour of joining the Allies should Western civilization be seriousy threatened. Then, like a bolt from the blue, he resigned from the *Avanti,* started his own new paper, *II Popolo d'Italia,* and in his first editorial advocated war. The air in Milan was almost blue with the imprecations and abusive epithets hurled at Mussolini by the Socialists. "Traitor! Hireling! Assassin!" He was immediately read out of the Party, and the *Avanti,* as if thus it could damn him to all eternity, refrained from mentioning his name for five whole years, because that would have been advertising him.

At the first call for volunteers Mussolini enlisted as a private among the mountain troops, fought the Austrians as vigorously as he had fought his political enemies at home, distinguished himself as a daring, fearless soldier and at length was seriously injured, sustaining forty wounds through the bursting of a mortar. His war-diary is a wonderful book, full of philosophy, poetry, stimulating economic and political thought, as well as of burning patriotism. One regiment stationed near his own presented him in camp with a memorial couched in these words: "To Benito Mussolini, who hearkened to the voice of the smoking ruins of Belgium, and of invaded France, and who asserted the rights of humanity against brute force. With the admiration of true Italians, and with the affection of his fellow-soldiers." That a document of this nature should be presented spontaneously to an obscure private is proof of the innate qualities of the man that would some day exalt him far above his native obscurity. The tactit prophecy has been amply fulfilled.

But mortars and cannon could not kill Mussolini. After the war it seemed as if his forty wounds had multiplied his energy and activity just that many times, if that were possible. And his great strength was sorely needed. He found himself between two enemies, which, like the upper and the nether millstones, were threatening to crush Italy and himself between them—Bolshevism, the one, and stupid, senile parliamentarianism, the other. The old-fashioned and senile professional politicians he accused of making no effort to readjust the returned soldiers to civilian life, and of not attempting any measure of social reform. In the eyes of Italians, the most convincing and damning charge was that these old "moss backs" had caused Italy, though a partner in a victorious war, to lose lamentably in the peace that followed. Without doubt, Mussolini's patriotic stand in this respect is historically the first cause of his rise to popularity and power.

Now I must bore you with a few dates. My apology for this is that these dates are dramatic. Bolshevism first broke out in Italy on February 18th, 1919, and Fascism was instituted just a month and five days later. In September, 1920, the Socialists seized the factories of Italy and two Fascists were executed for resistance. In 1921 occurred, or rather, exploded, the great railway strike, followed almost instantaneously by the general strike. Here, then, was the great opportunity for carrying out the promise or threat made by the Fascists at their congress in Rome in 1920: "Fascism will substitute itself for the State when the State conclusively shows itself unable to suppress disorder." In May, 1921, they nominated candidates for the General Election, and to the amazement of everybody won thereby thirty-three seats, Mussolini winning one of them. In September of 1922 he was offered a ministry without portfolio in the cabinet, but declined. Now that the world knows Mussolini as one of the great masters of man, it is humorus indeed to think of his ever having been offered a minor post. However, in the very next month his turn came.

To be exact, on October 20, 1922, in Naples he ordered his Black Shirts to march on Rome. Their rallying cry was simple, but stirring: "Only one passion inspires us: to contribute to the salvation and to the greatness of our country." As they drew near Rome, an army ludicrous in numbers and equipment, Facta, the Prime Minister, asked the King to proclaim martial law. Be it said to the unbounded credit of the King that he used his limited prerogative promptly and properly. "No, Mr. Premier," said he in effect, "Emphatically no, and instead I shall ask for your resignation, and shall offer your post to Benito Mussolini." On October 29th, 1922, Mussolini received and accepted the offer, and on leaving Milan for Rome that night said to his friends at the train, in his characteristic way, "To-morrow Italy will not have a Ministry; she will have a Government." The government that he inaugurated at noon on October 30th has been described by a Fascist sympathizer not as a revolution like the French Revolution, but rather as "an uprising of vindicators of moral values which had been trampled in the dust." It is my own conviction that despite many acts of Mussolini and his fellow Fascists that we may rightly censure, they were, at least at the outset, truly "vindicators of moral values" that had been forgotten by Bolshevist and Conservative alike.

Now, so much for Mussolini for awhile. But what about that curious thing the Italians call Fascismo? What does the name mean, and what does it stand for?

Primarily, Fascism is an organized attempt to realize once more in Italian politics the effective power formerly exercised by the heads of the old Roman Republic, and later of the Roman Empire. The symbol of power of the ancient authorities was the bundle of rods and axes borne by the lictors; from these bundles, or *Fasces,* comes the name Fascismo.

Broadly speaking, the Fascists are the best men of the younger generation of Italians, and by the best I mean the best educated, the most self-sacrificing in their patriotism and the most industrious. The organization exists, on the one hand, to oppose and suppress Bolshevism, and, on the other, to effect in Italy that kind of social and economic revolution which, for example, the English-speaking peoples have gained by slower and more constitutional means. Certain over-enthusiastic Fascists declare Fascism to be a method of government applicable to any nation; personally, I do not believe it; I am strongly of the opinion that it should be regarded as Italian only, and its success estimated solely in its effect upon Italy.

Now it should not be a matter for surprise that the energetic creator of political theory and practice like Fascism has unwittingly started a great many other theories and practices also. Although the Fascists seem to be solely men of action, they are in fact very passionate theorists. Carried away by the immensity of the Fascist movement, they are imbued with the idea that the whole world of human thought is being hurried by Fascism into a new era. Hence in Italy one finds set forth in unparelleled verbosity all sorts of new theories. There is the theory of Fascist Art (mostly theory as yet), the Fascist theory of Education (fundamentally a pretty sound one, too), the theory of Fascist culture, and, as a climax, a theory of Fascist ethics, fortunately based on the Roman theory of the days of Cato. Naturally, a mass of ideas of this kind cannot spread themselves without artificial means; hence a great Fascist journalism has sprung up, probably the greatest propagandist press the world has ever known in any country in time of peace. Above and behind this is an argus-eyed Fascist censorship from whose scrutiny no pamphlet, no paper, no magazine, no book can escape. All this is the spontaneous outgrowth of a single original shoot, the Fascist political movement, planted in the garden of Italian society by the master gardener, Mussolini.

The attitude of Fascism toward certain vexing questions can best be understood by a perusal of quotations from the speeches and writings of the Fascist leader, *II Duce,* as Mussolini is known to his partisans.

For instance, Fascism's employment of force has been vehemently censured. But the Fascists themselves say they have resorted to force chiefly as the only method with which to combat another force, that of Bolshevism, and that it is used only as a temporary means for the purpose of bringing peace to a distracted country. As Mussolini himself said: "The nation needs peace in order to recover, to restore itself, to fulfill its highest destinies. You do not understand, you do not wish to understand, that the country wishes to work without being disturbed." There is the case in a nutshell. And, mark you, these are words that Mussolini used in warning some of his too enthusiastic Fascists not to go to excess in their exercise of force in maintaining peace. However, even Mussolini himself, so far as an outsider can judge, does not seem to realize the lesson of history that they who put themselves into power by force find it hard to relinquish force.

According to Mussolini, Fascism's attitude toward imperialism has been misunderstood. Listen to the leader's own statement: "We must make plain once for all what we mean by Imperialism. Imperialism is the law of life, eternal and unchanging. At bottom it is nothing but the need, the desire, the will to expand, felt by every individual and by every nation with vitality. It is the methods employed which differentiate one form of imperialism from another. Imperialism need not necessarily be aristocratic and military; it can, on the contrary, be democratic, pacific, spiritual."

This, I take it, is, to us at least, a new conception of imperialism. Assuredly it needs interpretation, and we shall find it partly in the Italian temperament, partly in the character of Mussolini himself. Now, if the Italian is anything he is rhetorical and dramatic. Like a fisherman he does not intend to exaggerate, but nevertheless according to our standards he does exaggerate, but his fellow Italians know just the degree of discount to apply to the overstatement. (Laughter.) If we assume the Italian point of view we can understand pretty clearly what Mussolini's words and actions really mean so far as they are Italian. But we must also realize what they mean so far as they are his own. Facing a disunited Italy Mussolini says and does many things which are designed to rally all Italians about a common interest, whether that interest be a grievance against another nation or a serious policy affecting Italy alone. However, when he talks of Italian imperialism, his words are not all mere rhetoric, for always in the back of his mind there are those ominous figures—400,000 surplus population each year. In declaring against war Mussolini is truthful, I verily believe, but I sometimes fear that his manner of kindling the flame of imperialism may, despite his honest intentions to the contrary, start a fire which at a time of crisis cannot be put out. It is comforting to know that just now he is doing less than formerly to fan the flame.

What this Socialist really thinks of Capital and Capitalism makes very interesting reading.

"I do not intend to defend capitalism or capitalists," he wrote. "They, like everything human, have their defects. I only say that their possibilities of usefullness are not yet ended. Society has already assimilated some portion of Socialistic doctrines, which it has been able to adopt without evil results. Capitalism has borne the monstrous burden of war and to-day still has the strength to shoulder the burdens of peace. It is not simply and solely an accumulation of wealth; it is an elaboration, a selection, a coordination of values, which is the work of centuries."

In these latter days we hear much pro and con about "public ownership." Mussolini has his opinions about this also.

"State ownership: It leads only to absurd and monstrous conclusions: state ownership means state monopoly, concentrated in the hands of one party and its adherents, and that state brings only ruin and bankruptcy to all laborers, townsmen, mankind....This is a fact, proved by the experience of Russia, where state ownership produced a centralized tryanny. Property, after it has been nationalized, goes back into the hands of groups and individuals. Truly Socialism has a history full of paradox!"

Perhaps nothing is so disturbing to non-Italians as the reports that appear in the press from time to time of Mussolini's speeches on Italy's foreign policy. Undoubtedly it is the fair thing to have regard for his studied utterances rather than those which he has made in apparent heat and for Italian consumption only. Incidentally, in the quotation I am about to give, one gets an idea of his educational policy. I may add that, funadmentally, his whole policy is educational.

"I hold that, having broken the pride, which was one not of words alone, of Italian Bolshevism, Fascism ought to become the watchful guardian of our foreign policy. I think that Fascism ought to train up a generation of new men, without provincialism or local feeling, who would 'feel' the Italian problem, who would hold it to be a problem of self-consciousness, of expansion, of Italian prestige, in Europe and in the world, and, to attain this object, would adapt both minds and methods. If Italy wishes to play a guiding part in the destinies of the world, if Italy has the pride which she ought to have, she should prepare herself now; she should assemble a band of technical experts, of students who would bring both devotion and efficiency to the examination of special questions, and at the same time she ought to awaken amongst the great mass of Italians an interest in foreign policy. Only by these means can Italy become a great nation, and, what is even more important, while presenting herself to the outside world as one united and complete whole, preserve and safeguard her political unity at home. It is necessary to force Fascism to change its front, and to turn it away from bitter local quarrels in order that it may become the motive power of our foreign policy. A hard and ungrateful task, but a necessary one."

Now to bring a long story near to an end, what has this dynamo of a man accomplished? I shall not enumerate his many reforms for you know them as well as I do. All I shall say is this: over and above all of his achievements that have been reported he has been working, and still is working, upon two projects which are fundamental in character and greater than anything else he has undertaken; one in which he aims to get Italy to grow enough food to feed herself, and the other an attempt to establish compulsory education for all classes of citizens.

But what picture of this notable Italian will you carry away in your memory? I have purposely refrained until the present from commenting upon his physical appearance, largely in order to pique your curiosity. He is a man of normal medium height and build. Upon seeing him there are three things that will strike you immediately and with great force—the shape of his head, his eyes, his manner of movement. No other word than "intellectual" describes his head, although the psychologists say you cannot use the word in that way. And then his eyes! Oh, how he uses those piercing black orbs! They are, indeed, a very large part of his political capital, and he exploits them to the limit like a "movie" actor. His movements represent a combination of the two most contradictory things: impulsiveness and caution; speed and deliberateness. They betray a man who is capable of intense unselfish concentration and who, nevertheless, is at times afflicted with an abnormal self-consciousness. Indeed, Mussolini is a mass of contradictions, the great human paradox of our times. He is both genuine and a poseur; he is both modest and haughty; he is both calculating, and hot-headed; generous and austere; tender, yet brutally candid; national and yet international; both Socialist and Capitalist. Moreover, he is quite conscious of his own contradictions (which most of us are not) (Laughter.) We must remember *this* in measuring the man, his works and his words. Mussolini's one thought and ambition is to recreate and develop a strong united Italy. His model for the *nation* is ancient Rome at her greatest; his model for *himself* is Julius Caesar, in his aspect as Reformer and Leader and as author of Bellum Gallic. In every way and in every thing he is seeking first of all the advancement and the legitimate glory of his own country.

But we must not rate him as a purely selfish nationalist, for in his endeavors to redeem his beloved Italy from anarchy and from economic and spiritual ruin at the same time he saved all of Western civilization from these very same calamities. There is no doubt that the one human being who is responsible for the stemming of the tide of Bolshevism in its westward flow is Mussolini. But, you will ask, should Fascism therefore not be invoked for the political and economic healing of all the Western nations? My emphatic reply is, No, for in such a case as that we should each of us want to be a Mussolini. (Loud applause.)

The thanks of the club were voiced by the chairman.

HOW SPEED RECORDS ARE BROKEN

An Address by SIR MALCOLM CAMPBELL

March 3, 1932

Lieut.-Colonel George A. Drew, the President, introduced the speaker, who was welcomed by Hon. Mr. Henry, Prime Minister of Ontario.

Sir Malcolm Campbell: It gives me great pleasure to have this opportunity of paying my respects to this great city of yours. It also gives me the utmost pleasure to have the privilege of addressing this most distinguished gathering here to-day. The journey to Toronto has necessitated three nights on the train, by the time I return to New York tomorrow morning, and I can only say that I would gladly have covered double or treble that distance to have the honour of being entertained by this great club of yours. (Applause.)

When I first received this invitation a few days ago to be present here to-day, I made up my mind to come at all costs, if it could possibly be fitted in in the short space of time I had available before returning to England, because your club here is world renowned, and the Empire Club of Canada means so much. What I mean by that, and mean to infer, is that the very word "Empire" to us at home means everything.

Great Britain will always regard Canada as her offspring, and will bestow on her that same affection which every mother bestows on her son, and that affection will continue forever, as long as the years go by, even though that son has grown to maturity. (Applause.)

This son—Canada—has now made a way in the world for himself, and the huge success it has made leads me to say that Great Britain herself has a constant desire to share with Canada her joys and sorrows alike. (Applause.)

We in Great Britain at the present time are going through very troublesome times which entail tremendous sacrifices from all sides, but believe me, my dear friends, we are going to weather the storm—we will pull through (Applause), and I can assure you that the spirit of our people at home is better to-day than it has ever been before. (Applause.) We do, however, during these difficult times require your sympathy, which I am sure we have absloutely and entirely. (Applause.) There is a slogan which we should all adopt, both on this side of the Atlantic and the other, and that is "Community within the Empire", and to-day, with the speeding up of methods of transport, it means that distance becomes no objective whatever, which in turn means closer contact, closer friendships, and a still better possible feeling. (Applause.)

As an ordinary man in the street, and being no politician whatever, it occurs to me that it is possible—although it may not be—to cement and rivet Canada to Great Britain even closer than it is to-day. Tremendous advantages will occur not only to Great Britain, but to Canada herself, by so doing. (Applause.) Now, there are quite a number of people in the world who are of the opinion that the Mother Country is becoming effete. I can assure you that no statement is further from the truth than that, and I think you will all agree with me when I say that the very fact that Great Britain holds the land, water and air speed records definitely proves that our engineers are second to none in the world. (Applause.) And unless those engineers can produce the very best possible, the machines which captured those various records could never have possibly gained the world's honours (Applause.)

Now, I think that that car of mine, the *Blue Bird* is rather a remarkable testimony of the superiority of British workmanship and material, especially when it is considered that the car is over eight years old, and going better to-day than it has ever gone before. (Applause. Laughter.) Believe me, at the present time our manufacturers at home realize what cars are needed in the overseas dominions, and there are a number of our manufacturers who are producing cars which will absolutely meet any troubles under all conditions which you have around you in this part of the world.

Now, I would like to give you a brief history of this car, because it is, in my opinion, somewhat unique. We commenced building her as long ago as 1924, just over eight years ago, and it was designed to reach a maximum speed of only 180 miles per hour—three miles per minute. She has already reached a maximum speed of 267 miles per hour. A moment ago your Chairman put an idea into my head, to go after a new record at five miles per hour. (Laughter.) It is possible, if you have not got a suitable track for a speed of 250 or 260 miles per hour, you may be able to find me one somewhere here where we can go for this new record. (Laughter.)

The first engine which was employed in the *Blue Bird* was a Napier engine giving off approximately 500 horse power. We have rebuilt it to-day so that it gives off about 1,500 horse power. That speaks for the quality of British manufacture and material, to be able to take out a 500 horse power engine and put in its place one giving off 1,500 horse power.

I would like at this stage to mention something about the power plant. It is all British, of course, like everything else in the car. The first engine, as I said before, gave off approximately 500 horse power, and weighed about 790 pounds. The engine which we have to-day outwardly looks the same, weighs only 1,140 pounds, and gives off just under 1,500 horse power; in other words, well under one pound of weight per horse power. That is a marvelous achievement for the British manufacturers to have accomplished in a space of only about five years, and it shows how our engineers are progressing at home to-day.

The first record which the *Blue Bird* achieved was at Pentang, in Wales, at a speed of just under 175 miles per hour.

The car was more or less home built in my small workshop at home, but after the record was accomplished, my late friend and great sportsman, Sir Henry Seagrave, came out with a one thousand horse power car, and put the record up to 203 miles per hour. Now, in motor racing you must be determined or it is just as well to let the pastime alone. I shall never forget my feeling, having taken two years to build the car, at a rather large cost, and having got the record, to realize that within a month, I had lost it, the speed then being so high as to be beyond the capabilities of that car. In other words, within a month it was out of date. (Laughter.)

But we were determined to carry on, so we rebuilt the car once more. We took out the old engine of 500 horse power, and we put in the Napier, giving off 940 horse power, and we came out to Daytona in 1928 and succeeded in putting the record up to 207 miles an hour. Then, three months later, the American, Ray Keale, beat the record by one-half mile, and I spent the rest of that year looking for another place where a record could be attempted, because Daytona in the summer months is not as suitable owing to the softness of the sand.

In 1929 we altered the car again and put on a different body, and we went out to South Africa. I was very keen to try out the car on the inland courses, because obviously, although Daytona Beach is a wonderful stretch of sand, you can realize that the surface may vary from day to day, and you may have to wait weeks for a favourable opporunity, and you have not got very much time to accomplish the record between high and low tide. The course must be marked, and the timing apparatus must be installed, and if you have one bad bump in the middle of the course, it is highly dangerous.

So, as I say, I went out to South Africa in 1929 and made an attempt on the world's record on a dried-up desert lake, but we ran into such tremendous difficulties, which it was almost impossible to foresee—and in the meantime my friend Sir Henry Seagrave had visited Daytona with a brand new car and put the speed up to 231 miles an hour—and we struggled on in South Africa. I was out there over six months, and when the course was nearly finished, phenomonal rains fell, which put off our attempts and ruined all the work and money we had spent on preparing the surface. But we finally got the five mile and five kilometres record at 211 miles per hour and 216 miles per hour respectively, which have stood until the other day, when the *Blue Bird* improved upon them.

Then in 1930 we decided to still carry on, and the whole of the season of 1930 was spent in remodelling the *Blue Bird* once more.

I do not know whether it would interest you gentlemen to tell you how we managed to increase the speed, but I will take a chance and tell you roughly what we did.

The propeller shaft had always been in the centre of the chassis, and the driver had to sit above this propeller shaft, which meant there was a big windage, and as the windage increases with the square of the speed, you could imagine how important it was to cut down the wind resistance to a minimum. So, in 1930, to overcome this obstacle, which was inherent in the original design of the car, we off-set the propeller shaft to enable the driver to sit between that shaft and the chassis frame, and get the whole body much lower down, thus decreasing the tremendous resistance.

We removed the old engine and put in this 1,500 horsepower Napier super-charged motor, and came out to Daytona last February and succeeded in putting up a figure of 246 miles per hour.

Well, conditions were not too bad last year, but the beach was heavy, visibility was none too good, and I felt sure that the old car was capable, even in its present state, of increasing that figure by quite a margin, and that was one of the reasons why I came over here again this year to have another attempt.

Now, I would like to inform you about these world records and what one has to do. You have to go in both directions, and both runs have to be made in one hour of one another. Of course, that is a very fair rule, because if you only had to go one way, obviously the driver would wait until a very high wind was blowing, to get the full advantage of it, whereas, as you have to go in both directions, whatever you gain by velocity of the wind is more than lost when you come up against it.

That is rather interesting, and we are learning so much every time we go out. One soon learns to realize what little one really does know of the game. This last time, when I made my attempt on the world's record, on the 24th of February, the wind was blowing obliquely across the course, and had an estimated velocity of 40 miles an hour. When we went with the wind, we travelled 267 miles per hour, but coming up against it the best we could do was about 241. Now, an average is taken between these two speeds, and the average on that day was the record which now stands, of 253 miles per hour odd.

Of course, luck plays a tremendous part in all these proceedings, as it does in anything else of that kind, and to get the most out of the car, especially at the speed we were travelling, we required one hundred per cent. condition; otherwise it is impossible. You must have a surface as smooth as the proverbial billiard table; you want no wind, good visibility and perfect atmospheric conditions. If the atmosphere is heavy it is possible to lose as much as 50 horse power on account of it.

Then again, with regard to this smoothness of the course. If the car, travelling at a speed of over 200 miles per hour, hits a bump it may jump anywhere from 20 to 30 to 60 feet. While I was in South Africa, where we had insufficient funds to smooth out the course, which was a dried-up mud lake, I had several jumps in my car, the longest of which was 45 feet. Now, when you come to think of it, a car leaping 40 feet, it is a wonder that the tires and the machinery can stand the strains and stresses. That is why I am so frightfully proud of my car, because it has had all of these knocks during all these years, and is still better than ever. (Applause.)

Speaking about the wind, I have more or less found—and I do not say this is accurate, but it is the impression I have gained—that when you go at these speeds with the wind, you are travelling so much faster than when the wind is not blowing, but the most you can gain by the wind velocity is probably not more than 50 per cent. It really is less. But I reckon it is roughly about one-third. For example, in travelling with a 30-mile wind you can roughly estimate you are increasing your speed by about 10 miles an hour, but when you come up against the wind you are losing from two-thirds to three fourths of that velocity, so you can well imagine how important it is when making these attempts to drive on a perfectly still day. On both days in Daytona the wind was blowing more or less at the same velocity, but unfortunately there were many ripples all the way along the course of the beach, which gave the car a tremendous amount of wheel spin, and knocked off a lot of its speed, and in consequence the car was not doing its best on that occasion, and was certainly not very easy to control. When I come up against the wind, especially if it is oblique, the force of the wind is trying to force you off your course, and you must fight against that wind the whole time.

An interesting point is this: if you heard that the record stood, as it does at the present time, at 246 miles per hour, and you went out and put it up to 257 miles per hour, you would say, "What a marvelous achievement." But if on the other hand, you were told the last record had been beaten by merely a second, you would think, "that is nothing at all," But at 240 miles an hour, it means a mile in fifteen seconds, and a mile in fourteen seconds is 257 3/10ths miles per hour. So we are bucking against 1/5th and 1/10th of a second, and the feeling of the driver when going over the course is one of anxiety to get over that mile in the shortest space of time, and the driver realizes that any slight deviation from his course, any wheel spin, or anything of that kind will knock him off one-fifth of a second, and that is all the difference between failure and success. (Applause.)

I am always being asked about my impressions of speed. I have never really had any great impressions to describe. I never have any anxiety in regard to safety or anything like that, but one is obviously keyed up, because one is so anxious, as I have said, to do something, and it is more easy to fail than to succeed, and there are so many things coming into the picture which may prevent success.

Of course there is the thrill one possibly gets out of it, although one's mind is so much occupied in very deep concentration that one has not much time to visualize the sensations in the enormous acceleration possessed by a car of that nature. You may well imagine sitting behind an engine, perfectly balanced, giving off 1,500 horse power; when you let that loose, you can imagine that the rush through the air is something which almost beggars description. I believe it would be easier to imagine yourselves in a ball and being thrown through space, but there is no feeling of danger, because so far as my own car is concerned, it is perfectly constructed, and perfectly controlled, as long, of course, as the surface and conditions are right. When the conditions are wrong, then it does become a very great danger.

Then, too, your mind is so occupied with the details of handling the car. I have a revolutions speedometer on the car which tells me what the car is doing at any given instant.

The greatest difficulty is the slowing down process. If a tire happened to go on one end of a measured course, one would have to decelerate very slowly, because if you take your foot off suddenly the tort reaction is so great that it will send a car into a skid and out of control. It means that whatever happens to the car at any time, you must not lose your head and do anything with a sudden movement. It is the same with the steering. If you suddenly find your car going off the course, as I did, and if you pull at the steering wheel, and then begin getting excited and give it a violent pull around, disaster will be staring you in the face. You must do everything quite gently and never get excited about it. (Laughter and applause.) You must remember that once you have crossed the measured mile and have gradually removed your foot from the accelerator, you require roughly about five miles in which to pull the car up, (Applause.) and one gets the feeling then, for the first mile or two, when gradually reducing your speed from 240 to 230, 220, 200 and on down, you feel that you are entirely at the mercy of the car, because it is a hopeless proposition to put on your brakes. You know the course is clear, but you sometimes wonder whether you can pull up in time. That is the sensation one really gets; the question of impotency to pull the car up quickly after having reached the highest speed. On this last occasion, on a Friday, when we went for the long-distance record as well as the short ones, it necessitated driving the car with a full throttle for a very much longer distance than I ever have previously done, and it also meant slowing down over a longer course than previously. The only instance of excitement which occurred during the two days I was running at Daytona last week was the fact that when I was going at least 250 miles an hour, and was nearly at the end of the ten kilometer course, my goggles became clouded over, and I could see less than one hundred yards in front of the car. That definitely was unpleasant, but down there the organization is so good that I realized there was no possibility of anything being in my way. Therefore I carried on. (Applause.) That was the only little bit of unpleasantness which occurred during the whole time.

I am very proud of my car, gentlemen, as you can well imagine, and it is British down to the last nut and bolt. (Applause.) Any success which I have achieved in the past, or which any of us have previously achieved, is due obviously, nine-tenths of it—or ninety-nine out of one hundred parts of it, to those fellows at home who make the parts, because without that perfect machine it would be impossible to do anything, and I merely regard myself as one link in an extraordinarily strong chain. (Applause.) For example, my mechanics are the finest and most loyal set of mechanics you could possibly have, who have worked day and night to prepare that car; and I have such faith in them and faith in the car itself that I never worry in the least.

Now, the question of tires. Well, your President said something about tires bursting. May I say this? On the *Blue Bird* we use British tires, and we do not worry about bursts. (Applause.) Gentlemen, there is a great moral in that to you. (Applause.)

I hope I am not boring you, gentlemen. (Applause.)

Another point which is often raised by various people is the fact that they wonder what type of car this is, and whether it is more or less orthodox or not. Some people think you get into the car, half dope yourself, lock your steering, and trust to the Lord. (Applause.) I can only tell you my car is absolutely orthodox. It has a three-speed gear box and reverse. It has an ordinary clutch pedal, not worked by a vacuum, and a foot accelerator and a foot brake. The only thing is, that owing to the speed and the weight, the brakes are not of much value at a speed of over 100 miles an hour; otherwise it is all right. (Laughter.) The steering is quite orthodox; there is a lock on it, and I drive in the ordinary way, as you do in driving from place to place.

Now, I have often been asked, "Why do you make a habit of going after all these records?" "What inducement is there to do it"? and so forth, and so on.

The reason—really the prime reason, I am sure, with me—is the question of the joy of achievement, to set yourself a task and to overcome whatever difficulties crop up, and then eventually to get there, and believe me, it is a great joy when one can do that.

I always set myself a certain task to perform when going out for these records, and if I do not reach that particular goal, I do not feel happy with myself, and, frankly, I do not mind admitting I was not too pleased with the results achieved the other day, because I feel sure that my car is capable of a higher speed, but as I said before so much depends upon luck, because you must have the one hundred per cent conditions before the very best can be accomplished. It is also very gratifying indeed when these attempts are successful to realize that it is a testimony for British goods (Hear, hear), and after all, gentlemen, the reputation of the Old Country is the same as it ever has been before, that is, we have a reputation for building the very best, the goods which last for an indefinite period. (Applause.)

Might I once more suggest to you in all sincerity that our manufacturers at home are building cars suitable for your country, and that these cars will last far more years than any other cars built anywhere else in the world. (Applause.) It also occurs to me that these days where we have to look after finances, that it might be better to buy a British car which lasts two or three years, raher than other ones which have to be discarded at the end of the year.

Then, of course, comes the question of research, when tackling experimental work, and the altering of a design of a car is highly interesting to us, as there is a very great deal to be learned in the process. For instance, in altering the *Blue Bird* from the original 180 miles up to the point where she has gone very much faster than any speed we ever originally anticipated, and as I said before, I think there is still a bit more in the old car yet. (Laughter; applause.)

Gentlemen, I will now end my talk, but I thank you most sincerely and cordially for the wonderful reception you have given me, and I shall return to England with the most wonderful feeling of Toronto, and of this marvelous British spirit which is prevailing in this great city of yours. (Prolonged applause.)

BUSINESS AND POLITICS

AN ADDRESS BY COUNT SERGE FLEURY.

Thursday, March 10, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

COUNT SERGE FLEURY: First of all let me express to you the pleasure I have to-day of finding myself again in Canada. During the war I came in contact so often with your people, both French and English-speaking, and the memory of those contacts lingers with me yet. One of my great pleasures to-day is to be seated near my old friend General Mitchell, with whom I had some very happy times and helpful times during the war. (Applause.)

Now, coming to Canada has never given to me the impression of coming to a foreign country; it gives me the impression that I have come to a second patria, where I can always secure valuable ideas to bring back to my own country.

Speaking on the subject "Business and Politics," which is the subject of my address to-day, reminds me of a story I read the other day in *Memoirs of the Eighteenth Century*. It seems that a lady was asked one day what she would do if she was on a ship which was sinking, with her mother and her mother-in-law, being only able to save one of the two, and she thought awhile, and then said that she would save her mother and drown herself with her mother-in-law. (Laughter.) That is the same sort of a feeling I have occasionally when I hear people from time to time becoming annoyed at diplomats, and pretending they do not perform their duties, never remembering that every day brings its new tasks, and brings new problems to solve, which must be solved at once. If a problem would wait a week or two, if would be possible to work it out much easier.

I have often wondered why the diplomats have ceased to be popular amongst their fellow men, and why people turn up their noses at them, never thinking that diplomats do not have until the end of time to get out of their difficulties.

This reminds me of another story—and I know you like stories, and when I am telling you one I am not probably too much of a bore—of an event which occurred in the Eighteenth Century in connection with a man who was a great philosopher, named Mr. Sworr. One day he was working quietly in his study when his wife appeared on the scene and said, "Mr. Sworr, I do not like you any more". He looked at her, and then continued with his work. So she insisted on having some sort of an answer, and he said, "Well, that will come back again," And then she saw that the impression she had made was not sufficient, so she said, "I am awfully sorry to tell you that I like somebody else," and he looked at her a moment, and then he said "Well, that will pass too". In the same manner, after a little while, people will realize that if diplomats do arrive late, it only gives more time to people to make up their minds again, (Laughter.) It is like the story of a man who, when he was asked why he was always late in doing what the Emperor told him to, said that he always liked to give the kings and the great statesmen the opportunity of changing their minds. (Laughter.)

When I hear people criticising diplomats, I always think that people seem to still believe in fairy tales; they still believe they can come into a large room like this and find it absolutey empty, and simply by expressing a wish, they find the wonderful dishes such as we have enjoyed this noon. They want really too much, the people; they want the State to interfere with their difficulties, like the man who was on a fishing trip, and did not find any trout in the river where he formerly found them, and he declared seriously that a thing like that was absolutely disgraceful, that it was the fault of the State, and that the State should stock the rivers with trout.

Now, when people see the difficulties in the world they think the only ones to blame for them—because we all like to blame somebody else for our faults—are the diplomats, for not solving the problems immediately. What really happens is this; people have the wrong idea about diplomacy and its possibilities. It is a little like all the people, when they are ill, wanting the doctor to do all the work, and simply wanting to sleep if they are tired. But it has always appeared to me that you yourselves must help people if you are to be helped by them. In other words, the people have thought that diplomats are like hunters, passing through their difficulties in the same way that the hunters pass through the forests, and spending the balance of their time leading a society life, probably drinking cocktails, and perhaps dancing a great deal and working very little. Other people seem to have a nice idea that diplomats are sent by their countries to other countries to see what may be done, broadly speaking, with the nations where they are residing, and to attempt by every means within their power to make new friends and cement the old ones for their own country.

As to others, they think that diplomats like to create difficulties between nations, and then when everything is more or less upset, they come along with a sweet smile and make everything smooth again. It is a constant fight between diplomats and other people, just as it is in some parts of the Zoo, as to which will eat the other. The experts pretend that diplomats cannot talk about anything but economics, and are absolutely unable to help their country. That really is the difficulty to-day. There are perhaps too many statistics and those are the things which are hurting the world.

It may be the diplomats do not always follow the example of Louis Forteille, who, when he signed the

Treaty of the Pyrenees, wanted to have a certain number of economic sections written into the treaty, but as a rule, especially in recent years, most of the diplomats have shown that they know quite a lot, even more than is necessary, about economics, but if by any chance they are only political men, who have no special qualifications for that, they cannot be considered always as experts, nor can they always have experts at their side to consult with them on special occasions or on special missions.

What matters really, if we want the world to progress, is to know really where we are, and we want to create a sane and good feeling between nations if we hope ever to come close to disarmament. We must have first disarmament of hearts and the disarmament of economics before we can hope for the other and greater disarmament to take place, which can only be possible when the first two obtain.

In thinking about economics, it means very often bringing a nation against another. So many nations, if you leave them in the hands of cold experts, are bound to be advised at certain times to do what possibly is not in the best interests of that nation. On the other hand, if you leave those things to be solved by the diplomats, you will be sure that everything will be done, even though you perhaps think it takes a little time to do it. You may be sure that the diplomat will study the proposal, not only from the point of view of how much revenue it will bring, from customs and so forth, but he will study both the possible harm and the possible benefit, from that point of view.

I can give you a very good example of that fact. Recently an increase of time was contemplated by France against a neighbour, when it appeared to our diplomats that the measure, which was after all just an ordinary economic measure, on account of the depreciation of the money of that country, was taken in sort of an unfriendly spirit, and with the hope of avoiding any difficulty, they did some diplomatic work in connection with it, and succeeded in avoiding the creation of any hard feelings. (Applause.)

If you left the world only in the hands of the experts, where would the world go? It would certainly go to the dogs; there is no doubt about that, and you will find on occasions like that that at the proper time the poor diplomat, who always comes so late, comes in time to heal the wounds and make things look better than they are.

What we want actually in the world is hope. We do not want to listen to cold facts. We want more of the strong men who are capable of seeing what will happen in the future, and are capable of bringing those things to pass. Briand, whose death is regretted in France and other countries, belonged to that class of statesmen who work hand in hand with the diplomats, and who had common interest with them, and who availed himself of information after asking them to give the necessary knowledge of the facts about which he wanted to speak. The problems in this world will only be solved by men who have the right intentions, and who are endeavouring to create good will and happiness to those who belong in it, and who are capable of showing that the word "Peace" is not an empty word, but is and can be a wonderful reality. Those who have taken the place of Briand in France have the same aim, and diplomacy for them is really becoming an effort to create friendly relationships and understandings between the nations. (Applause.)

One of the reasons I cannot say that the politics of France are not going to be interfered with, are not going to change, is by the fact of the disappearance from the political scene of M. Briand, and by the way that conference of disarmament was prepared under his guidance. I happened, a few weeks before I left France, to be in touch with a lot of friends of mine who had been working hard in the preparation of the conference, and the resolution which was offered the other day by M. Dalgier shows the work that had already been done, and it also shows that many experts are doing good work (laughter), and it showed that the best way of bringing the world to believe in disarmament was to have the world protected. What we want in France actually—and I am not speaking from my diplomatic point of view, but from the point of view of the man on the street—nobody really wants to fight again, but we want only to feel that we are safe, and to feel that notwithstanding that Paris is only 500 kilometers from the frontier, there are ways of protecting that frontier besides the use of arms, for we are quite ready to hand to the League of Nations the protection of France and all the other countries of the world, if the League of Nations is capable of accepting it, and one of the reasons which I think will help the disarmament will be if certain proposals which were made the other day are accepted. If we can bring the big scientists of the world to realize that there is no good in talking about friendship between nations, and about good will between nations, if every other day the scientists of the world are discovering new ways for killing more of their neighbours.

What we want actually in this world is a little more common sense. There was once an attorney who said that pretty nearly everybody in the world pretends to have common sense. I suppose it has become like gold, something very difficult to find, but really if people could face the facts and compel the scientists to spend their time inventing something more definite in the way of peace, rather than in the way of killing men, a great deal of the problem would be solved. (Applause.)

I spoke the other day to some friends of mine in the country, to some peasants, about the disarmament, and if they thought it was possible, and tried to ascertain what they did think about it, and to my great astonishment, and I may say my great pleasure, I found that they had studied the matter most carefully, and they said that they wished it really was possible to find a way of stopping war. I said, "Do you not think it is impossible to stop all wars; there have always been wars in the history". They said that they felt everybody in the world was actually fighting just for the sake of fighting one another, and they said that they were perfectly content to stay in their fields and work them, and let the other men sit at their desks, and carry on their work as business men, but what they really want to be able to come back to the olden times when there was no hatred, and only good feeling between the nations.

There is one other thing which I am afraid will have to be attended to if nations are to be directed into the right direction, and that is to get a little more friendliness between the nations so far as the tariffs are concerned. Unfortunately, occassionally we do forget that trade means exchange. I do not want to criticize anybody, because there is an impression abroad to-day that perhaps some of the tariffs are too high, which accounts for the present position in which we find ourselves at the present time. For myself, I believe that everybody is honestly trying to find what is the best thing to do, but in doing that, they are inclined to forget their neighbours, and in forgetting their neighbours, perhaps they are forgetting themselves. It may be proving a little boomerang. You have to be nice to your neighbours for yourselves, because when you are nasty to them the time comes when he is bound to be nasty to you, even if he does not like it. After all, the best policy is a smile, and that is what I am glad to see on your faces to-day, as it gives me courage to go on, and ruin your beautiful language. (Laughter.)

If only people could come to some sort of an understanding, and realize that certain nations have certain things, and other nations possess other things, then there will be a real market in the world for all the produce of all the countries. If you say "I will give you so much wheat, and you allow me to get so much of the produce of your country, I think then you will find that the problem has gone a long way towards being solved. (Applause.)

GILBERT AND SULLIVAN

Two Addresses by MR. REGINALD STEWART and MR. A. MUNRO GRIER, K.C.

Thursday, March 17, 1932

Lieut.-Colonel George A. Drew, President, introduced the speakers.

Mr. Stewart: When I was asked by your distinguished president and managing directors to say some-, thing on Sir Arthur Sullivan, his life and his work, I was so enthralled by the possibilities and charm of the subject, which has always been dear to my heart, that without thought I said, "Certainly, I will be delighted to do it." Within ten minutes I was mildly alarmed. In half an hour's time I was horrified, and before the hour was out I was filled with agony and misgivings—firstly, that the subject upon which I had so readily arranged to speak was one of such huge dimensions that it was well-nigh madness for me to attempt it in the short time at my disposal, and, secondly, that it was madness in full measure for one of such intelligence to attempt it under any circumstance. Whereupon I entered into a conflict—a very unequal conflict I may say—with the men responsible, such conflict resulting in my total defeat and apparent victory for the other side. I say "apparent" advisedly because I know their victory will be of a very doubtful kind, and before these remarks are concluded they will be amazed at their own fool-hardiness in pressing a matter which has had such a disastrous effect upon them. (Laughter.)

Sullivan's life was so full and, to my way of thinking, so complete that anything approximating a biographical sketch here would be utter folly. I shall cheerfully content myself with giving you a few thoughts about the man and his work which you in your acquaintance with him might have failed to notice. I say this myself only because I know that the popular impression which prevails today is that Sir Arthur Sullivan was a writer of comic operas, who, had he been given the opportunity, might have produced a few good serious works capable of ranking with the finest products of his time. How many people realize that he did produce fine master works, great, magnificent achievements in the realm of serious music? How many people realize that from 1870 to his death in 1900 Sullivan was the most forceful figure in British music? He would leave his composing and travel to the North to conduct a concert and have to dash back to the train to get back to London before the audience had even filed out of the hall. Queen Victoria, the Prince of Wales, the Duke of Edinburgh were his most intimate friends, and when anything of an official nature had to be composed Sullivan was requested to do it. When any big national movement had to be launched it was to Sullivan they came. When any of the large continental symphony orchestras and festival choirs wanted new British works they came to Sullivan. At the Prince of Wales' request he was made princpal of the National Training School of Music for British musicians, out of which emerged in the fullness of time the Royal College of Music. In short, he was looked upon as the leader of musical thought, saviour of British music.

I think few people realize that Sullivan wrote more religious music than he did secular, and that in the years between 1871 and 1874, in addition to writing many cantatas, overtures and oratorios, etc., he wrote no fewer than 47 hymns. I am not going to say that all of the hymns are splendid musical works, but a great many of them have attained tremendous popularity—such hymns as *Onward Christian Soldiers,* for instance. He always felt that he composed religious music best, and his later writing of religious music showed how clear, how full, was his understanding of religious thought in music. Somewhere stored in the back of his brain was an inexhaustible store of memory upon which he drew to express religion as no contemporary composers could express it, with the exception perhaps of Stayner.

The strain of his busy life and demands of his body for rest-demands which were flung aside-militated against his health, and from 1879 he suffered terribly from a stone in the kidney which afflicted him at intervals with relentless agony. In the train, even when conducting his concert ,the enemy would awake and assault him. He once wrote in his diary after a performance at the Royal Albert Hall, "I did not see the audience. I did not even hear the applause, for the tears were rushing out of my eyes in agony." It is rather characteristic of the man that many of the merry, sparkling tones of his operas were written while he was suffering great pain. He once said to a friend, "It is perhaps rather interesting that the music to Pinafore, which was considered so merry and so sparkling, was written while I was suffering tortures from a cruel illness. I would write a few bars and then be almost insensible from pain. When the paroxysms had passed I would again compose a few bars until the pain overwhelmed me again." Never was music written under such distressing conditions.

By the way, now that I have come to the operas, it might be rather interesting to you to know something of how these two, Gilbert and Sullivan, came to meet and later to collaborate. I do not think for a moment that I am giving you this information for the first time. I quite realize a good many of you here are familiar with everything I have said, and a good many privileged persons, like Mr. Munro Grier, have actually witnessed first performances of the operas and consequently are much better qualified to discuss the subject than I. Those of you who are familiar with their background will remember that this partnership, which turned out to be the greatest partnership in light opera the world has ever known, and probably will ever know, was unheralded and unexpected. It just happened. Frederick Clay, a composer friend of Sullivan, was collaborating with Gilbert in the writing of a piece called *Ages Ago,* and Frederick Clay asked Sullivan if he would like to come down to rehearsal. At that rehearsal Gilbert and Sullivan met. There was no portent at that meeting of any future collaboration that was to prove so remarkable. No collaboration was discussed or even suggested. I am sure it never even entered their minds. The collaboration first took form in the mind of D'Oyly Carte, who was at that time managing the Theatre Royal, in Soho. This is the year 1875. Chancing to meet Gilbert on the street, D'Oyly Carte asked Gilbert if he could write a piece which he could give to Sullivan for setting, and D'Oyly Carte's remark called to Gilbert's mind a piece that he had written some time before, and with the thing in his pocket he went down a few days later to see Sullivan and read it over to him. He seemed quite dissatisfied with the work, which he called *Trial By Jury,* and which was a satire on British justice with special reference to breach of promise cases. Sullivan was overjoyed at the thing and completed the music in two weeks. D'Oyly Carte then produced it in March, 1875, and from the very first night there was no doubt about its success. It drew all London, for it contained freshness and cleverness quite absent from current productions. The house was filled at every performance. Even standing room was exhausted, and the piece ran triumphantly for more than a year.

Such then was the beginning of a friendship and a partnership that was to last for a great many years and was destined to completely change the complexion and the conception of English light operatic movement. The operas were so successful that they were produced in nearly every country and their authors' names became household words. Sullivan tells a rather amusing incident that happened whilst he was making a tour in the States. He went to visit some friends in California, and on the way he stopped off at a small mining town and the driver said to him, "You are expected here, Mr. Sullivan". Sure enough, there was gathered a small knot of prominent citizens in front of the store where they stopped, and a tall man came up to Sullivan and he said, "How much do you weigh?", and Sullivan said, "one hundred and sixty two pounds." "Hell,! how did you come to give hell to John H. Sheehan?"—(Laughter.) "I did not give hell to John H. Sheehan." "Are not you John H. Sullivan, the slugger? Who are you anyway?" "I am Arthur Sullivan." "Arthur Sullivan! Are you the guy that put *Pinafore* together?" "Yes, I am." "Well, say, we are just as glad to see you as the slugger any day, come and have a drink." (Laughter.) And so the success of the operas continued through the production of *Trial By Jury, His Majesty's Ship Pinafore, Iolanthe, Princess Ida, The Mikado, The Yeomen of the Guard and The Gondoliers.*

And then occurred the rift in the lute. These two who had worked so harmoniously together for fifteen years quarrelled, and all over a carpet—a historic carpet now, but one that was shorn of all magical effect. Just when the partnership seemed more secure than ever the thunderbolt fell. Gilbert wrote to Sullivan that he had been having trouble with D'Oyly Carte, that he had been appalled to learn that the initial expense in connection with *The Gondoliers* had amounted to the stupendous sum of $4,500. This, it seemed to him, was so unaccountable that he had asked for details, and the most surprising item had been $500 for a new carpet for the front of the house. (Laughter.) The agreement that the authors had with D'Oyly Carte was that they were liable only for expenses incidental to the performance, and Gilbert objected. At first Sullivan attempted to keep out of the controversy, but later he had to take sides and he did so in favour of D'Oyly Carte. I have made some extracts from Sullivan's diary at that period, which shows how serious was the situation when, on April 26th, 1890, Sullivan wrote: "Long interview between Gilbert and myself. He gave me account of interview between

D'Oyly Carte and himself. I could not agree with him on some of the disputed points about which the quarrel arose, such as question of renewal of worn out carpets and responsibility of the preliminary stage expense. As a discussion of the accounts seemed advisable and very much desired by Gilbert, I undertook to arrange a meeting at my house between Gilbert, D'Oyly Carte and myself for calm consideration of them, Gilbert himself suggesting that we should meet and discuss them on the condition that no reference whatever should be made on either side to the heated conversations which had taken place between himself and Carte. I undertook to arrange this and proposed that it should stand over for a week as I was anxious to go out of town and the delay would tend to smooth matters. April 27th—Gilbert came to see me and brought with him a paper showing the heads of new agreement to be made between us three. These he read to me and left paper with me for consideration. I myself proposed a delay in taking any active steps for a week. Gilbert agreed with me in this, quoting from *The Gondoliers,* and giving me the impression that the breach should not be widened but, on the contrary, that our mutual relations should be placed on our former amicable footing."

That Sullivan agreed with D'Oyly Carte in this dispute angered Gilbert who wrote a letter to Sullivan dated May 5th: "The time for putting an end to our collaboration has at last arrived. In accordance therefore with the points of my note to you this morning I am writing a letter to D'Oyly Carte of which I enclose copy, giving him notice that he is not to produce or perform any of my libretti after Christmas of 1890. In point of fact, after the withdrawal of *The Gondoliers* our united work will be heard in public no more."

Once these words were written any chance of the partnership surviving disappeared and Sullivan had no choice but to send his agreement to the termination of the collaboration. A few days after the lawsuit which resulted, Gilbert wrote to Sullivan suggesting a reconciliation with D'Oyly Carte, but Sullivan replied with great frankness in a letter which I have copied for you. He says to Gilbert:

> "You will, I am sure, readily understand the difficulty I feel in answering your letter. My old personal regard for you as a friend pleads as strongly to let the past be, and I find it pleading out of our years of friendship as if they had never been lived through, as if the pain and suffering I, and I honestly believe you also, have endured, have been only a nightmare. I am only human and I confess frankly of my feeling of the ungenerous treatment I have received at your hands. If there is to be a reconciliation let it be a thorough one with confidence restored all round, not merely a patched up truce, but confidence cannot be restored while you still contend no other course was open to you but to take the action which was, and you are doing your nature a grave injustice in pleading this. I would much rather believe, as I now solemnly believe, that you plunged without forethought into these disastrous proceedings in a fit of uncontrolled anger, greatly influenced by the bad health you were suffering. Do not think me exaggerating when I tell you I am physically and mentally ill. I have not yet got over the shock of seeing our names coupled—not in brilliant collaboration for work destined for world-wide celebrity, but in hostile antagonism over a few miserable points."

As he weeks passed the breach widened. Meanwhile the Savoy Theatre was filled to overflowing. All seats for the performance were gone days before. The public realized something was amiss, and when Gilbert put his case in the hands of lawyers they realized that the dispute had reached very serious proportions. It was not until November that there was any sign of cessation of hostilities, but on November 11th, Sullivan wrote in his diary: "Gilbert had an interview with D'Oyly Carte and admitted he was wrong." Then there was peace at the Savoy, but the collaboration, when it was resumed, was never the same again. The old spirit that had made it the adventure, the romance had departed for them. They wrote two more operas—*Utopia* and *The Grand Duke* and although they were not very successful they must have held some pleasant memories for the authors, not the least of which would be their joint appearance together on the stage of the Savoy Theatre on the occasion of the first appearance of *Utopia*. They shook hands and the world rejoiced.

Now, my time is up and so we shall leave these two shaking hands on the stage of the Savoy Theatre. If they had only been given eyes to look out upon the future and see the thousand performances that have been given of their works, to have seen the pages of an eulogistic nature that had been printed of them, I am sure they would have experienced a sense of gratification that no other twain in the history of the world would have experienced. Of Sullivan I say as my final tribute, that more than a quarter of a century has passed over his dust, yet his work remains the last pillar in the whole structure of English composition. He created a form of light music which the years have striven vainly to copy, and just as the lapidarist may strive in vain to imitate a gem, so in turn they fail who strive to imitate Sullivan. In all of his work he was a melodist. He sang of light, of life, the heart of life, and he gave back to life what he derived from it—the understanding and the sympathy of the human race. (Loud applause.)

MR. MONRO GRIER: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, so far as I can make out from my watch which, like its owner, is very inaccurate at times, I have only two or three minutes to bother you with. (The time allotted for broadcasting the meeting was almost exhausted.)

VOICES: Go on, go on.

MR. GRIER: I must say that I really have been the victim of a most extraordinary set of charges—the most serious of which is, perhaps, that I have 'accurate knowledge' of the matters about which I am going to talk to you. I absolutely refute any such statement, a refutation which you will consider to have been superfluous by the time I have finished talking to you.

And now to start. Imagine my amazement when I came to read the notice of this present meeting, which stated that my remarks would have a "negro background." Well, really, you know I was somewhat dumbfounded. What did it mean? I felt that I was ready to take up the white man's burden. But this! I did not, as I still do not, know quite what to think of it. Of course there was a sort of faint suggestion of revelancy in indicating the contrast between any background I could give and the brilliancy of Gilbert's own work. Black against white, so to speak.

You will recall that of all the people who lived in his time, it has been suggested that virtually anybody might have written Shakepeare's works except Shakespeare himself. For instance, they were discovered by an American lady by the name of Hogg, or some such name, to have been written by Bacon. The last utterance upon the subject known to me was by a man who said he was quite convinced that they were not written by Shakespeare, but by a gentleman of the same name.

Now, if by any chance the announcement cards of this present meeting should get out in the southerly part of the United States of America, you will find some American lady writing from there, say 300 or 500 years hence, stating that no such characters as Gilbert and Sullivan ever lived, but that they were in fact two other men with the same initials, G. & S., but Stewart standing for Sullivan and Grier for Gilbert—(laughter)—and that, in point of fact, they were two coloured gentlemen—(laughter)—of extraordinary erudition, who came from the southern States of the United States of America. (Laughter.)

Besides those interesting items—they are transcendent, of course, in importance—I must really give you some bald facts—Gilbert was born in 1836 and died on May 29th, 1911. It is interesting to reflect that there were distinct points of likeness between him and the historic character of Sir Humphrey Gilbert, from whom the family claims to have been descended. They were both hot in temper; their physical proportions were much the same, and they both had a passion for the sea. It was said of one of Gilbert's plays that it was salted with sea brine, and, of course, Sir Humphrey Gilbert was a very great navigator in his day. I venture to say, but of course *sotto voce,* it is entirely likely, if we ever come to deal with the purchase of Newfoundland, that its people will claim a great price, by reason of the facts that Sir Humphrey Gilbert founded it, and that W. S. Gilbert was one of our great English poets. (Laughter.)

I must pass on quickly. Perhaps I should give you something of Gilbert's life. He went, at the age of thirteen, to Great Ealing School, which numbered amongst its pupils, at one time or another, Thackeray, John Henry Newman, Thomas Huxley and Captain Marryat. From Great Ealing School he went to King's College and stayed there a short while; and then, the Crimean War being on at that time, he determined to apply for a commission in the army. He did so apply, but happily for us today that war came to a rather abrupt end and Gilbert turned his attention elesewhere. He then took a position in the Educational Department of the Privy Council Office, but finally went in, as doubtless you know, for the English Bar.

I shall not be able to give you much of legal (which I now understand was the telephoned original of "negro") background, though I may say a word or two on matters legal as I go on. Gilbert's first literary efforts were contributed to *Fun,* a very humorous and, in my judgment, quite excellent journal, which ran contemporaneously with *Punch* for a considerable number of years. Amongst the contributions to that paper were some of the *Bab Ballads,* which were issued from time to time, and which if any of you have not read them, I strongly recommend you to read, if for no other reason, because the core of nearly every opera that Gilbert afterwards came to write is to be found in them.

He wrote in all about 22 plays, and amongst them one called *Rozenkrantz and Guildenstern,* which was a sort of travesty on *Hamlet.* He objected to calling such a production by the name of *Hamlet.* I give you two lines, which, to my mind, are very joyous ones, in view of the extraordinary amount of altercation that has gone on through the ages as to whether Hamlet was or was not insane. Gilbert came to this conclusion:

Hamlet is idiotically sane,
With lucid intervals of lunacy. (Laughter.)

I may say, in respect to my utterance to-day, there are only two claims I make, one is that I exhibit throughout the spirit of topsy-turvydom, and the other that I occasionally exhibit lucid intervals of lunacy.

I shall for a moment engage your attention with reference to *Patience,* of which I saw a performance during its original run in London. I do this because I want to throw out something which, to my mind, should be very encouraging to such of you as have imagination and to whom the world hereafter may be indebted for some fine invention. When I saw *Patience* at the Savoy Theatre, it was the first theatre—certainly in England and I think anywhere in the world—lighted by incandescent electric light. I may say that gas was kept in reserve in case of failure, but the gas was never called upon. Therefore, it was a very wonderful occasion for myself entering as a young lad. Now, I want you to pay particular attention to the following:

Assume that, on the evening when I was there, some one had come up to a certain young lad and had said to him: "Listen, my lad, the time will come when you will be interested in a development of power made simply by means of tumbling water, which will produce enough electricity to illuminate not one theatre only, but myriads of theatres of the size of this; a time when you yourself, thanks to the extraordinary range of activities and avenues to and along which electrical energy will be devoted, will be addressing an audience through a medium to be called 'Radio' upon the subject of this play *Patience*, an audience that will hear every word you utter though some of them may be hundreds or thousands of miles away from you or from each other."

Assume further that the young fellow, who at that time was studying law in London, had known that the man speaking to him was a trustee of an estate for which his Firm acted as Solicitors and had succeeded in getting a commission *de lunatico inquirendo* with regard to that trustee. Almost inevitably the man would have been adjudged a lunatic and have lost his trusteeship. Yet every single word of the apparently wild prediction would have been absolutely justified.

Now, let me give you one or two other points that occur to me with regard to Gilbert. In the first place, there is the spirit of topsy-turvydom, which is a notable, an outstanding thing in his works and which perhaps started with his *Palace of Truth,* in which he made the characters speak the truth "willy nilly." Another thing is his capacity to discern the essential weakness of any human being, or of any class or aggregation of people with whom, or with which, he was dealing. He had a most amazing and unerring capacity to seize upon the weak points. He could get at the essential things, and if you want to realize how true that is, just, in retrospect, contemplate the joy you had in listening to-day to the song of a Lord Chancellor (so admirably rendered by Mr. Lucas) recounting the agonies suffered by a man who could not sleep comfortably in bed.

Another quality that is very evident is Gilbert's capacity to state conditions, sentiments, emotions, what-not, in the fewest possible words. If you want to study that, look at some of the songs, filled with sentiment, yet with a minimum number of words.

Then, passing on to another point which occurs to me, observe his great lyrical quality. It may surprise some of you to know, if you have not already heard it, that Sullivan, whilst recognizing that Gilbert was not inherently musical, yet recognized that he had a most amazing capacity for the appreciation of lyrical quality, and much preferred his words, for the setting of music, to the best songs by Tennyson. Another critic, in speaking to some people, put them in a ferment when, after giving the names of quite a number of lyrical writers, he stated that Gilbert was better than the whole lot of them put together.

Can I go on for a minute or two longer?

VOICES: Yes, yes.

MR. GRIER: I ought to give you one or two stories, although you have already listened to some, because, mark you, stories told of Gilbert really illustrate the man. Gilbert gave Boughton, an artist, and his wife two first-night tickets to *Ruddigore*. Boughton, in his letter of thanks to Gilbert, said that he was inclined to the view of the critics who thought that *Ruddigore* suggested "bloody gore." Gilbert, in replying said ,"I cannot at all agree with you that there is the slightest connection between 'ruddy' and 'bloody'. For instance, if I were to call your cheek a 'ruddy' cheek, that would be poetical licence. But if I were to call your letter 'bloody' cheek—that would be the strict truth."

Burnand, who was then Editor of *Punch*, once said to Gilbert: "You have no idea how many good things I get from perfectly unknown people", to which Gilbert replied "Do you, my dear fellow? Then why the deuce don't you print them?"

A certain rather commonplace tragic actor was always hinting that he was an Oxford man—which he was not. At a Garrick dinner he vociferated: "When I was at Oxford, when I was in Oxford—" which Gilbert cut short with the monosyllable "Street!"

The following story does give a certain amount of legal background to my utterance. It must be borne in mind that it relates to a judge in England and not to one in Canada. Gilbert frequently indulged in litigation, but was not always successful. In one instance he lost disastrously, and, in writing of the case afterwards he said "The judge was in the last stage of senile decay. He knew absolutely nothing whatever about the case." (Laughter.)

The next story, and the last I am going to tell, deals with a trick played by Gilbert on a Shakespearean pundit, whose solemnity bored him. Gilbert enquired of him the meaning and context of the following line: "I would as lief creep through a quickset hedge as cry 'plush' to a throttle." In reply the pundit evaded the question as to the context and proceeded to explain the meaning of the words. " 'Lief,' you must know, is the Anglo-Saxon 'lieb,' and as for the 'cry "plush" to a throttle' it is a rare term of the bird-limer's art, of which Shakespeare was a master." "Quite so," said Gilbert, "many thanks, only I wrote the line, not Shakespeare."

Gilbert had once expressed this wish: "I should like to die upon a summer day in my own garden." In the morning of the day of his death, 29th May, 1911, he went to Chelsea Hospital to spend some time there with his friends Sir Charles and Lady Crutchley. From there he went to the Junior Carlton Club, where he saw Kendal, the actor, with whom and with whose wife he had been "at outs," and they had a very pleasant and friendly luncheon together. He then called at a hospital to see a Miss Fortescue, a beautiful actress, who recently had met with an accident. She had been thrown from her horse, and the jolt had affected her optic nerve. She was kept largely in the dark, and here I give you Gilbert's last jest, a charming and beautiful thing. The mother of Miss Fortescue, meeting him before he went in to see her daughter, said to him: I won't ask what you think of her appearance, for you can scarcely see her." And Gilbert replied, "Her appearance matters nothing; it is her disappearance we could not stand." That evening, in the swimming pool in his garden at Grim's Dyke, at

Harrow, he had as guests Miss Winifred Emery and a pupil of hers. Miss Emery and her pupil started to swim before Gilbert got into the water. The pupil went ahead of Miss Emery, and presently cried out that she was drowning. Miss Emery thereupon called to Gilbert, who rushed into the water and swam quickly to the young girl and said to her, "Put your hands on my shoulders and don't struggle." This she did, but almost immediately cried out that he had sunk under her hand and had not come up. His body was recovered by the gardener who went out in a boat. There was no water in the lungs, and his death was not due to drowning, but to heart failure. To those of you who are interested in coincidences it will be interesting to know that the doctors in effect uttered the last line of Gilbert's then reigning success, *The Hooligan,* namely,—"Dead—Heart Failure."

Now I am sorry if I have trespassed on your time, but I cannot sit down on this day, St. Patrick's Day, without expressing the hope, no matter what the views of certain of those who are resident in that blessed isle may be, that we shall always find that the several component parts of this great Empire may remain intact just as they do at the present moment. It was not very long ago that I, in company with many of you here, listened to Sir Malcolm Campbell, and were glad to congratulate ourselves on the fact that there are some general qualities which pertain really to the several portions of the Empire. Speaking for myself, I have never got over the immense effect produced on my mind on listening to a man who at one time was an enemy, and fought against the British namely, General Smuts—(Applause.) Something that he referred to then, and which has often been in our minds, I should like to allude to now:—that in the British Empire there is throughout it, from east to west, north to south, a spirit which, deny it as some may, is constantly there—the spirit which dominates in work as well as in play. Indeed, I sometimes think that I never feel so close to the Empire, as a whole, as when I am sitting in Lord's cricket grounds, because, not only am I seated amongst those who come from the several parts of the Empire, but I am seated amongst those who are content, as befits Gilbert's fellow citizens, to listen tolerantly to criticisms of themselves and are chiefly concerned in this: That in whatever they do, whether it be work or play, they play cricket. (Applause.)

THE ART OF LISTENING

AN ADDRESS BY SIR JOHN ADAMS.

Thursday, March 31, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President introduced the speaker.

SIR JOHN ADAMS: The subject I would like to speak on really is "Listening; the art of listening", with deviations as we go along.

There is more cruelty in the world through lack of good listening than any other cause. When Burns wrote the lines, "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn", he could not get a better example than the way in which we do not listen to other people. You all know in your own experiences how, when you make a remark to another person, the answer to that remark is not an answer to you at all, but the reaction of that particular person.

On one occasion, going down from London to Plymouth to lecture, there were two persons in the carriage with me, one on each side of the window, a man and a woman. They did not know each other at first, but the man did something complimentary about the window, and the woman was pleased, and the man ventured the remark "That is a very remarkable school we just passed". Now, I have a weakness of pricking up my ears at certain subjects, and accordingly at the word "school" I pricked up my ears, although I had no business to. The lady replied, "My boy is at Rugby". The man said—this was one af the schools called the Municipal Secondary School—"Rugby was where the late Doctor Arnold was", and the talk continued, and I took out my watch and began noticing. It went on like that for twenty-fve minutes, and reminded me—she is not dragged in—I was really reminded—of an old Irish woman who was optimistic. Not that she had much to be optimistic about, poor old lady, she had only two teeth in her head, but she remarked, "Thank God they meet." (Laughter.) Now, here was a conversation which lasted five and twenty minutes, and never met (Laughter.) They could be written out separately as consecutive statements.

Now, in our life—and I do not think I need emphasize this to an audience like this—if there were more women present I would be very emphatic (laughter)—the point is that they do not listen to one another. My students in California are a fine set, five thousand girls of all the colors of the rainbow, and all talking at once. I put it to one of them once. I said, "How do you manage Miss So-and-so, when four or five of you are all talking at the same time?," And her answer was, "It is like this, Professor Adams, if anybody says anything worth hearing we all hear it." (Laughter.)

That, then, is the aesthetic side, but suppose we come down to the professional side. Those of us who lecture are really exponents of the art of listening. We ought to extend listening and understand it, see how other people are doing it, and get within their minds and work from within outward, but unfortunately our art—the art of lecturing—is in a parlous state at the present time; we are being snuffed out. Editors and lawyers and authors generally have been rather badly used of late, because of these new fangled means of communication. Formerly, a decently good lecturer could go anywhere and get a job, Now, unless you are a super-lecturer, you have but a very small chance, and the chances are gradually diminishing. The reasons are those infernal instruments which have occurred of late, which are working us out altogether. (Laughter.) They kill out time and space. Formerly, if you gave a lecture, you had to be there to give it (laughter), and the people had to be there to hear it, but now by virtue of this abominable thing called the radio, space is eliminated, and you can stay at home and listen to the lecture or not, just as you please.

Speaking about the moral aspect of listening, even that is spoiled at the present time by means of the radio; it spoils our morals. We look at the thing there, and if we do not like what the man is saying, we press a button, and that is the end of it. It seems to me if those buttons had a reflex on both sides, it would have a wonderful effect. (Laughter.)

All this makes it very difficult for us to keep up our job as lecturers. Then, not only is space eliminated, but time has gone by the board. The time was when in addressing an audience you either took them or you did not, as the case may be, and if you made an observation, you might, before going away, have somebody say, "What do you mean by saying So-and-so", and you could say, "My dear fellow, you have it wrong; it is badly reported." (Laughter.) You cannot do that now. If you do, they produce this abominable instrument which records back not only your words, but your very accent, and what can you do? (Laughter.) So at the present time only the super-excellent speakers have any chance at all.

On the other hand, there is fortunately a desire among us human beings to see one another; we like to see the man saying the very words; we like to make sure he is there, and not a mere spirit in the air, about which we are not so sure now. But, as I say, altogether, we are in a parlous state.

And in this connection, there is an instrument which does not exist, which probably never will exist, but which I would like very much to see exist. It has a hybrid name; it is called a "phrenometer". There is no use in my trying to spell the word, because I got into a bad habit with my students in seeing how they spelled words. In other words, I got curious results (Laughter.)

My first lecture in the London University was to an audience of Oxford and Cambridge girls, who came up for advanced education, and it was on "The Ego". Curiously enough, in Scotland they called it "Ego", with the long sound of "E"; the professors seem to find it easier to so pronounce it, than to put the short sound upon the "E". So my first lecture, after I had been expounding for perhaps a quarter of an hour, was interrupted by a young lady who rose, and very politely asked what the subject of the lecture was. (Laughter.) They had an idea that it was a lecture on "ornithology". (Laughter.) I see that some of you see the point already. (Laughter.) Now, there is no great harm in that, but it taught me a lesson, and that is why I would like to call this instrument the "phrenometer", which comes from two ancient words, phreno, meaning the mind, and meter, meaning measuring, and the entire word meaning the measuring of the mind. We want that instrument very badly, but we do not have it. It is of course simply a figure of speech, a metaphor, to compare it with a thermometer. I have always envied the teachers of physical sciences, because they have such definite material to work upon. An old professor of London used to complain bitterly about the way in which the nobler sciences were treated, metaphysics, and logic, and all those mysterious things. We want an instrument in the science of the mind, to do the work of the phrenometer in the popular sense of that term.

Gentlemen, can you imagine an instrument shaped something like a thermometer, with a bulb at the bottom —there is no need for the bulb at the bottom, but it is good for the imagination. (Laughter.) And then we come to one point which corresponds to the freezing point of water. We call that "the inference point". Then, after a rather long zone, which may be called the "inference zone", up near the top there is another point which we may call a "groping point", and beyond that there is the final point, beyond which we cannot go, which I would like to call the "gaping point." (Laughter.)

Start now with this phrenometer, the lower regions, before we come to the inference point, and indicate the observation zone. Within that we do not need to do any thinking; we just jump at conclusions. Some of us in this room are fairly good at that, but after all we do not use our ability along that line systematically; we do not use our reasoning power nearly so much as we think we do. We could not get on with our work if we had to reason out each thing, if we had to work always in the inference zone. We are content to work in the observation zone, where we draw conclusions without going through any reasoning process.

For instance, a man comes home in the evening and as he goes upstairs, he says to his wife, "I see Jack has come in". He sees nothing of that kind. Jack is not there. He sees a battered straw hat, a pair of gloves, none too clean, and a cane, so he says, "Jack has come home." Another example is if you were to go down to the seashore and see one of the old salts there, a man who has weathered many a storm, and you ask him what the prospects of the weather are for tomorrow, and he says, "I see it is going to be a fine day." Now, he sees nothing of the kind. He sees a certain stratum of clouds, and feels a certain humidity in the atmosphere, and in the past he has learned to associate those signs with a fine day tomorrow, so he says, "I see it is going to be a fine day." He is working on his observation zone.

Now, take an example which is not a true one—not actually true, but it is true as regards behaviour and true in actual facts, but not in detail.

Supposing, for example, you felt you were not very well, and your wife thinks you are worse than you do yourself—by exception (laughter)—and in that case she says, "You must have the doctor", and the doctor is brought along, and he looks at you, and as he looks at you he takes out his pencil and begins to write in a little notebook, talking to your wife all the time—and not about you either (laughter); it may be about the rose show, or the latest thing in fashions, but he writes out the thing and hands it to your wife, and goes away, and leaves you furious. You say, "That fellow is not doing his job; he does not do the things he ought to have done; he did not thump my chest; he did not ask me to say "99" (laughter), as every decent doctor would." (Laughter.)

Now, if your wife knows psychology—which I hope she does not—(laughter)—she would begin talking and say, "John, don't worry about it; he came in and he knows you. He has treated you before for the 'flu; you are suffering from the 'flu now, and there are a great many people in town, and the doctor knows all about it, so do not worry, you will be all right tomorrow". The Doctor comes back tomorrow, and finds you pink. (Laughter.) Now, I understand on the best medical authority that you have no right to be pink on the second day of the influenza. The moment he sees you, he has risen to his inference point. He begins to ask you all sorts of questions. No trouble about it this time; he thumps you all over, and asks you all manner of impertinent questions, and he cannot make anything out of it, He goes off, and hurries around to his other patients that morning in order to be back in time to see how things are going, and he hurries home to his house and dashes to his study and pulls out all the books which are necessary, and tries to find out all the chromatic elements of medicine, and he cannot find why you should be pink that morning. So he comes along early in the afternoon to see you, and by this time you are slightly orange. (Laughter.) He does not understand that either, so he rings up his friend. This friend whom I have in mind was a Scotchman, named McArthur, and he said, "I say, McArthur, last night I saw a fellow with the ordinary 'flu, and I gave him the usual dope, and this morning the beggar is pink. I have just been to see him, and now he is orange; what do you make of it?" It so happens that this friend has been in America long enough to acquire the American language, and a thorough knowledge of it, and he knows the proper answer.

The proper answer is "Search me." (Laughter.) But he added, "I will come along, and we will go and see the beggar and see what he is like now." So they come along, and they find him slightly greenish, and they examine him in every possible way, and your own doctor says to your wife, "I think there is nothing really serious; I do not want you to be alarmed, but we would like an expert in. Would you allow us to call in the great chromatic specialist, Doctor Madden". She says, "If it is as bad as that, we must have him". So Doctor Madden comes in the evening and the three of them stand by the bedside, and examine you, and then they go into a side room and come to conclusions not fit for publication (laughter), and they come out and say "We are not sure about this exactly; I do not think you need to be alarmed; we will come back tomorrow morning and see what can be done". Then they go away and pray, individually and collectively, that something will happen during the night which will indicate what the trouble is. (Laughter.) Well, this not being a true story, we will drop it. We all have a desire for a happy ending, and we will assume that the next morning you are a normal colour, and the three men go away rejoicing.

That is one example of the work of the phrenometer. At the beginning, the doctor was in the observation zone; the next day when you changed color he came to the inference point, and then up and up toward the groping point, where they had the conference on what would happen, and when they reached the groping point, they were in a position of being absolutely distressed; they do not know even what to ask next. (Laughter.) Keep in view your own experiences, and when you find you are coming near this groping point, be ready for the gaping point, and when you reach that, what will you do? The answer is "gape." (Laughter.)

And then, you being wise men, you naturally turn to something else, and begin to think of something else, and then possibly come back to this.

Take another example; this time a true one. An old lady connected with a church got a letter from her minister which she could not read. I say that literally; she could not read one single word. She knew that it was from the Minister because at the top in block letters was printed the name of the Manse, but what he wrote about she had not the least idea. She had a son-in-law who was a school master, and supposed to be an authority on bad handwriting, so she handed it over to him, and he glanced at it for a moment, and suddenly found he was at the gaping point himself, straight away. He did not know anything at all. He asked a question or two; had she been asking the Clergyman about anything; she could not remember; so he went away, and at school he did the best he could, and while on his way he did as many of you do on similar occasions, he whipped out the thing and opened it, to see if he could take it by surprise. (Laughter.) Now, it is not a bad plan, and sometimes succeeds, when you reach a point where you are worried over some problem for a long time, and you cannot arrive at any fixed point, that if you will begin thinking about something else, and then suddenly go back to it, something may appear to you which will appear intelligent at least on the surface.

However, the school master could make nothing of it, and he went to school and taught the first lesson, and took the paper out again—nothing at all. Another hour's teaching, and he came back and thought that he had made a discovery; he thought he had found the word "Jehu" in it. He knew that this letter was from a clergyman, and it seemed like a likely word, only it did not seem to help him very much. He did not know anyone of that name. So he went back to his class. He came back to the letter, and thought maybe he was wrong, that perhaps it might be "John", and the second word looked like "pleuch", but he did not know anybody named "John Pleuch", or even "Jehu Pleuch," so he went back again, and thought it over, and then he thought he had found one or two things, and he found a word which he thought looked like "mother", in the plural, but he did not know whether it was mother's or mothers'; he could not be sure (laughter), so he went back home, and he went to the old lady and he said, "Here is a word which I think is either 'mother's or 'mothers' ', and she paid no attention to that; it was of no interest to her. But she was struck by the very word itself, and that made her think of something else, and she said, "Oh, I know now; it must be mothers'; that must be about the mothers' meeting I conduct every week, and not only that, but I remember now that I asked him to recommend to me a book suitable for reading at mothers' meetings. The was the very thing, and he has evidently given me a book. And they tried to think of a book which would be likely to be read at a mothers' meeting. Our school master friend was rather religious, and he turned the matter over in his mind as to some religious book, and he remembered one book which was called, not "John Pleuch", but "John Ploughman's book", a very suitable book to be read at mothers' meetings—a big book with small print (laughter)—very interesting.

From that point onward they went on and discovered the whole of the letter. The meaning of the whole thing came gradually bit by bit. That is an example of the application of the non-existent instrument of the phrenometer.

Now, during our life it is worth our while to keep this instrument in mind in relation to other people. We are very apt to make serious mistakes in life. Other people think you are on the same level of the phrenometer as they are. Very often we are speaking in the observation zone, and the other fellow is really at the gaping point; he does not know what we are talking about.

What we want especially is a classification of backgrounds. You intelligent men in business know, speaking generally, the sort of background of the man you are talking with. Most of you here are successful, or you would not be here (laughter), and if you are successful, then you have a knowledge of backgrounds. You may never have sat down and deliberately said "Let us study the backgrounds", but when a man has come in to see you, you are looking at him, and trying to figure out his background, and you are thinking it all the time without knowing it, and you are working in the observation zone, and are picturing how to appeal to him. You know, you approach one man in one way, and another man in another way. If you are a lawyer you watch your jurymen, and put a kind of a background behind each one of them, so you may endeavour to hit upon a particular point which would appeal to a particular man. The cross-examiner in court is feeling for the proper background, some of it very unfairly. A very favorite habit of lawyers is to confound the two things, memory and imagination. Most people do not realize that they are counterparts of one another; memory works backwards, and imagination works forward, as a rule, although it can work backward every now and again. (Laughter.) And a lawyer will put nasty questions. I will never forget a particular case I saw in London where a good, decent business man, thoroughly honest, was on the stand, and the lawyer said, "When you went into the room, did you open the door?" The witness said, "I must have opened the door", and the lawyer said, "I am not asking you what you must have done; did you open the door?" The man, after some hesitation felt that he must have opened the door if he had gone into the room, said "Yes, I opened the door". Then the question was put, "Was the handle on the left hand side or the right hand side of the door?" My friend did not know which it was, but on the whole he thought that the right hand would be a good guess, so he guessed the right hand side. The lawyer was very much discouraged, because he thought he had drawn him out, and then he said, "Mr. So-and-so, you say you remember opening the door, and you turned the handle, did you not?" Again my friend said, "Yes, I turned it," because he thought he could venture as far as that, and then the lawyer said, "Did you turn it to the right hand side or the left?" (Laughter.) So my friend was in a complete box; he did not know how to go about it, because some handles turn to the right, and some to the left, and finally he knew if he said one thing and it was wrong, he would be damned as an inaccurate witness, and so he said, "I really cannot remember", and the lawyer turned to the Jury, he said, "You see, our friend cannot remember; he remembered he opened the door, and turned the handle, but when he was asked to answer something which can be verified, he cannot give a proper answer". (Laughter.)

We ourselves ought to remember that a great deal of what we regard as memory is actually imagination. Our memories recall a certain number of things, but in a while our friendly imagination comes along, and fills up the gaps, and that is certainly a desirable position.

Now, I have made a careful study of a person known to all of you in this room, a person called "Sherlock Holmes". He had a way of finding out things in a mysterious way, so it seemed, but he was really applying what I am calling now the practical side.

Now, in ordinary life we have a great deal of Sherlock Holmes' work being done every day.

You are probably aware that there was a real, genuine, two-legged alive Sherlock Holmes. That was not his name, but he was an external lecturer in the University of Edinburgh. His name was Joe Bell. The students of the University admired him very much for the way in which he could find out things which they could not find out for themselves. When Conan Doyle went up to Edinburgh he was talking to Joe Bell, and Joe Bell was talking to him, and he appointed Conan Doyle as his recorder at the clinics. Just imagine if you can that, this is the clinic room, only of course it would be empty except for chairs for thirty or forty students at the rear, a chair here for the patient ,a desk here occupied by Mr. Bell. Now, the usual professor beings "What is your name; what is your occupation; what do you think is the matter with you?" and all that sort of thing, but Conan Doyle's friend, Joe Bell, usually looked at the man and told him things such as "You are a bricklayer, are you not?" or, "You are a blacksmith, are you not?" and in one particular case of which Conan Doyle told me himself, a man came in and sat down, and Joe Bell looked at him, and he said, "You are an old soldier?" "Yes, sir"; "Recently discharged?", "Yes, sir"; "Highland Regiment?" "Yes, sir"; "Served in the West Indies?" "Yes, sir"; "You are a bank messenger now, are you not?" "Yes, sir", and some of the students wanted to know how in the world he knew those things. He explained, first of all, that the walk of the man indicated he was a soldier; secondly he did not take his hat off when he came in immediately, the way an ordinary person would, and that showed that he was not long out of the service; he was a non-commissioned officer, by the way he swaggered (laughter), and then he was with the Highland Regiment, because he was in Edinburgh and they always have a Highland Regiment there, and he knew he served in the West Indies by the fact that he had a mark of the bite of an insect on his forehead, and that insect exists only in the West Indies. That was a very satisfactory state of affairs, and occurred in reality, and was worked out in one of Conan Doyle's books, "The Sign of the Four", I think it was, when Watson is very suspicious of Sherlock Holmes and does not think he knows very much, and he has had a gift of a watch from his brother, who recently died, and he handed the watch to Sherlock Holmes, and he said, "This is my brother's watch", he said "Can you tell me about my brother from that watch?" Sherlock Holmes produced the usual eye-glass, and examined the watch carefully, and he said "I am sorry, I cannot tell you very much about your brother from this watch, because it has been recently cleaned; if you had given me a good old dirty watch, I would have told you all about him." I found that thing true in my own experience from an old doctor named Doctor McKlimm, in Glasgow, who if you showed him your watch could tell you which side of the Clyde you had spent your holidays upon as the sand is different on the one side than the other, and he could tell you immediately whether you came from Millport, Ellen, or Rothsay, or from some other place.

So, in the case I was speaking of, Sherlock Holmes said, "All I can tell you is that you belong to an old family, of rather good descent; further, your brother was very erratic in his life, and given to drink, I am sorry to say, and further he had many ups and downs in life, sometimes in good circumstances, and sometimes in bad. Watson was very angry, and he said "You found out all about my brother, and you are trying to palm it off on me as information from the watch". Holmes said "No, certainly not. What I see in the watch is this. First, it is in the nature of an heirloom; there is a big crest on the outside. In all old families a watch of that kind goes down from father to son, and the eldest son gets it, therefore your brother was older than you." Watson said "That is all very true, but what about the ups and downs"? Holmes said "There is a piece of information—and incidentally I do not suppose any of you here know anything about it; I did not, until I was told by Conan Doyle—but in the pawn shops they give you a ticket when you go in, "John Adams, so much money, so-and-so", but in addition to that they make a little private mark for their own edification. Holmes said on this particular watch there are four or five of these marks (laughter), and obviously he had been up and down a good deal. With regard to the drink;"—and he opened it up, and it was not one of these watches that you wind by the stem, but a key-wind watch, where you inserted the key in a small hole in the case, and upon looking closely Holmes had noticed a great many marks which should not have been there, and obviously the man had not always been sober when he wound up his watch. (Laughter.) So he knew all of those things from the watch, and all the workings were really in the inference zone. He did not know just at once; he had to think about the thing as he went along.

There are other cases which have occurred in my own experience rising along the potential use of the phrenometer.

On one occasion I was walking in London, and stayed for a considerable time in a street where the university college is—I forget the name of it—

A VOICE: Gower Street.

PROFESSOR ADAMS: Yes, thank you, Gower Street. I stayed there with another man about my own age at that time, who was suffering from a disease which is quite common in Scotland, and I believe it is quite common also in this country, it is called "calf love." (Laughter.) It was a bad case. Her name was Nellie—well, it was not Nellie at all; I would not give her away in that manner, but he spent a great deal of time with her, and talked a great deal about her. But by and by the disease passed away, along with Nellie. (Laughter.) Four or five years afterwards I was in the same room, and my friend called on me rather excitedly, and he said, "A curious thing happened to me yesterday; do you remember Nellie Walker?"—as if I could ever forget the young lady; after living with him (laughter)—and I said "I do seem to remember something about her", and he said "I have not thought about her for four and one-half years, and yet when I came to call in a house here in Gilford Street, as I went up the stairs I knew I was to meet Nellie, and when the maid opened the drawing room door, there she was". And then he used that phrase which I hope you will not use here to-day, "How do you account for that?" (Laughter.) Well, it is not my business to account for that. (Laughter.) However, I did my best, and I said, "Had Nellie any particular scent she was fond of?" All of you psychologists know that scent is the most prominent recollector of the past—and this chap had been a very generous suitor, and had spent lavishly upon her, and had given her an umbrella, a presentation umbrella, one of those umbrellas with a silver handle—real silver—one of those umbrellas which can be recovered a great many times—and Nellie was Scotch. (Laughter.) We looked into the matter, and found that she still had that umbrella, and that it had been in the umbrella stand when he called, and he did not know that it was there, but seeing it brought her back into his mind and into his thoughts.

Take another case of another student of a different type altogether, who was an engineer, and was connected with the gas works at Crewe. One night we got a telegam saying that his uncle in charge of the gas works had fallen suddenly ill, and the Government of the place thought it would be better to have one who had spent his childhood in that neighborhood, rather than get a new person, even of more mature years, who did not know the work. My friend was proud of that, and started down to Crewe and arrived there and worked hard on the job, far harder than he ought to have done, and when it came night his head would no sooner hit the pillow than he would fall asleep. One night he awoke, and he had had a horrible dream that there was going to be an explosion at two o'clock, and he looked at his watch, and found it was one o'clock. The impression was so great, that he got up and hurried down to the works, and found there would have been an explosion at two o'clock if he had not interfered. Again you ask me, "How do you account for that?" We tried to study it together. I said "How did you know when you got down there that there was to be an explosion at two o'clock?" And he said, "I knew it by the indicator", and I said, "What is that?" and he said, "That is a lead pellet, which moves up and down, and when it moves down it reaches the gasometer, and when it gets to a certain position, it blows up. I wonder if any of you will say "That is not a gasometer" you have in mind this nice round clock-faced sort of thing, but remember this was fifty-five years ago, and they had a leaden pellet moving up and down.

I said to him, "When you saw that, how did you know there was to be an explosion?" and he said, "You could easily calculate that", and I said "Could I calculate that?" and he said "No, you are an outsider, but anyone who is used to it would know what would occur." The explanation was quite obvious. He had passed the place a dozen times during the day, and his eye had caught this little pellet slightly at any rate; he paid no particular attention to it, and then when he fell asleep and his mind rested, it came back and began doing his work, and his mind, even though unconsciously, had reached the inference point, and drew a conclusion, and he jumped up and thought about it, and put the thing right.

We could naturally go on and give a great many cases of this kind, but I have been very well trained as a speaker, and my time is one-half minute from the end, therefore I propose to stop now, and throw myself upon your mercy, and thank you for your great attention. It is a great joy to meet here and to see the Union Jack. I have not seen one for a long time, except one they have at Los Angeles for special cases, which is a very small one. I have given on two occasions the Fourth of July addresses in American cities, which shows that they are not so bitter against us, and sometimes they get a big flag. Out in Colorado, they have a flag bigger than that of the United States; they use it because they have no other Union Jack, and I thought it was always a rather generous thing to do. I was led to say this, even though it has no connection with my subject, still it is of great connection with the Empire Club. (Prolonged applause.)

A vote of thanks was proposed by the Hon. Mr. Henry, Prime Minister of Ontario.

THE INTERPRETERS OF CANADA

AN ADDRESS BY MR. ARTHUR STRINGER.

Thursday, April 7, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

MR. STRINGER: During the recent election in England, a candidate for parliament in the North of England began his nightly spell-binding by pointing to the Union Jack and saying: "I was born an Englishman, I have lived an Englishman; and I hope to die an Englishman." Whereupon a Scotchman at the back of the hall said: "Hoot man, hae ye no ambitions." (Laughter.) Now, as your Chairman has told you, I was born in Canada and I have lived in Canada and if I did not remember what Dr. Johnson has said about patriotism being the last resort of a rogue, I would say that I hoped to die in Canada. (Laughter.) But coming as I do from the land of the bootlegger—(laughter)—and if I did not weigh a little over 200 pounds, I would say that coming back to my native country made me feel like a whale who was coming up to breathe. (Laughter.) It also makes me feel like a desert camel who has at last reached its oasis—(laughter)—and having been in this fair city of Toronto for a couple of days brings home to me what was really troubling Robert Barr when he complained that Canadians were willing to spend more money on their whiskey than they did on their authors. Speaking of whiskey, I am reminded that my literary career really began in the city of Toronto, for it was here, with the simple faith of the young, I took a sheaf of manuscripts to a sad-eyed editor and asked him why I could not sell them, what was the matter with them. And that sad-eyed old editor looked them over, and then sat back in his chair. "There is an idea or two here, Stringer," he said, "but ideas, you know, are like whiskey—they should be left to ripen in the wood."—(laughter)—"So what I advise you Stringer, is really for quite a long while to keep these ideas in your head." (Laughter.)

This Dominion of ours in the earlier days of Robert Barr did not spend much money on her authors. She did not spend much time on them either. She had enough troubles, and those authors, if they wanted to remain authors, had to look for markets outside their native country. For you know, no matter how romantic we may be about the rights of the author, the aesthetic equipment is not always an assurance of commercial prosperity or earthly well being, which recalls to me the story of the huge negro who had been tried for a particularly atrocious crime. The presiding judge asked him if before the execution of the sentence he had anything to say, whereupon he replied: "Yas sir, I thinks I has, I has just one thing to say—if youse hangs me, judge, youse hangs the best singer in all Tennessee." (Laughter.) I recall how some cynical Demosthenes of the daily press once put the rhetorical question—I do not know whether it was Hector Charlesworth or not—Where are our Canadian poets? And a new cynical Toronto editor said: "On the train to New York." (Laughter.)

Now, it seems at first almost a fine thing to have a foreign metropolis to send your poets and authors to. Plato pointed that out to us two thousand years ago when he wrote his Republic, and he suggested that while it might be expedient to honor the man of the pen, to anoint him with oil and crown him with bay-leaves, if you had to it might be equally expedient to pass him quietly on to the next town. (Laughter.) So we bought them a ticket for New York and gave them our blessing and went back to the serious work of building up a brand new country, and it was fine and noble work of conquering a wilderness, of creating new cities and making homes and roads and bridges, and throwing a double line of steel across a continent, and pushing the frontier up towards the pole, amalgamating a country that stretched from the Maritimes to the Mackenzie into one unified confederation. It was a great job. It is something we are all proud of, but we sit back and wonder now and then just how that pride is going to express itself. For as Earl Grey said when he was Governor-General of this Dominion: "Canada has been too busy writing her history with the gun and the axe and the plough to bother about writing it with the pen." Or, to quote his exact words when speaking of Canadians: "Their energies are so much absorbed in this task that it would be unreasonable to expect them to be in the van of movements which aim at the realization of the higher and nobler life."

You know that is not such a tag to put on a nation. I have seen a great many authors who could not be pointed out as walking examples of the higher and nobler life. (Laughter.) But at the same time I would like to remind you of three or four lines that I am particularly fond of, and often quote, that were written nearly two thousand years ago, lines from the Ninth Ode of the fourth book of Horace:

They missed their chieftains
And their sages' pride;
They had no poet
And they died.
In vain they planned,
In vain they bled;
They had no poet
And they died.

Or I might recall to you a line or two of Shakespeare. I refer to that scene where the pigheaded old Polonius stands beside Hamlet and blinks at the visiting play, marvelling that such vagabonds could take their parts seriously enough to weep over them. Hamlet, you may remember, turns to Polonius and says:

Will you see the players well bestowed.
Do you hear? Let them be well used;
They are the abstracts and chronicles
Of the times.

Now, Horace never built a Roman arch or a Roman road, though his voice is a living voice two thousand years after Rome has crumbled into the dust, and Hamlet is no man of action, though he remains the greatest example of a man of thought ever created by a human brain, and they are both announcing by implication that a great nation must have a great voice, that there is not much use in doing a big thing unless it is recorded in a big way, and the recording is done, obviously, by a motley company of ink slingers and canvas daubers who, while engaged in the solemn task of holding mirrors up to nature are confronted by the equally solemn obligation of earning their daily bread.

Now, this young nation of ours did not need to bother much about its authors and artists. When they got too hungry at home we shipped them away to some other country, and when we put down the hammer and the axe and forget about ploughs and power plants and stood back from our work and wondered what it was all about. and nursed a human enough hunger, not only for a little entertainment but also for a little enlightening as to what we were really heading for, we remembered that we had a big and benevolent neighbor right beside us who could give us all the ready-made amusement we wanted, and it looked like a lucky break to have a kind-hearted Uncle Sam ready to shovel out to us all the motion pictures and the theatrical entertainment and the *Saturday Evening Post* that we seemed to need. But it had its drawbacks. Take, for example, the case of the stage. We know the noblest and truest expression of a nation's life has been through its drama. We remember with a thrill of pride that England produced Shakespeare, but we must also remember that this great Dominion of ours, flung from sea to sea, with a national life as bounding in vigour as it is defective in character, with the stamp of bigness on both its accomplishment and its promise, is without a stage of its own, is without a school of dramatists, is without one dramatic composition in any way expressive of its wider issues. In other words, Canada is the only country in the world of continental dimensions which depends on foreigners for the spiritual refreshment and inspiration coming to us, or supposed to be coming to us, by way of the theatre. We take what is offered us by the Hebraic and kind-hearted gentlemen along that canyon of noise and vulgarity known as Broadway, the gentlemen who in crossing the line sometimes forget to substitute the Union Jack for the grand old rag known as the Stars and Stripes in the last act finale.

Then there is the problem of the motion picture. Whether we like them or not we have to face the fact that the movies stand for a new art in this mechanized age of ours, that they tie up in one oddly mongrelized sheaf the earlier activities of the sculptor and the painter and the musician and the poet and the dramatist. It is the new way of interpreting life, of holding the mirror up to nature. It has captured the world and it would seem the one vehicle that could and should interpret to the world the beauty and splendor of our Dominion. But I have just used the word "mechanized", and that is where the catch is. For the movies, even before becoming an art, have become an industry. The screen world has set up a kingdom of its own—a goldplated principality known as Hollywood, and to that celluloid kingdom most of the outside world is merely a series of calumnies. It may have begun, I admit, as an accident of climate and scenery, since the sunlight of Southern California is particularly rich in attinic rays and the landscape is as variegated as the whims of its leading stars, but they are a shrewd organization of mechanical inventiveness and the cancellation of the distribution agencies and iniquities of block booking, which have just been legalized by the Court of Appeal in Washington two days ago, and perhaps by the blind good luck of getting off to an early start, Hollywood is even more monopolistic than the stage of Broadway. It is today. And if we as Canadians do not like the two million dollar picture it dumps at our doors, we can lump it, or we can try making our own pictures and, having made them, sit down and wonder whether we can get into a theatre to show them. Now, it is plain, of course, that the machinery for the exploitation of the movie venture, like the exploitation of the modern dramatic effort, is a complicated and costly matter, and since co-operation and combination of interests is the tendency of the times, it may look like a good thing to have a sort of central clearing house for the weeding out of the incompetents on the one hand and distribution of the hits and successes on the other. But the system has its flaws. Some of those flaws you have seen with your own eyes from Hollywood's idea of a Royal Mounted Police in Knight of Pythias uniform—(Laughter)—to the ubiquitous gang leader who really has a heart of gold, and the crooning tenor who apparently has adenoids—(laughter)—and its hair-oiled heroes who ought to be picking pansies and its platinum blonde heroines who ought to be back at the ribbon counter. But it has flaws of more insidious drawbacks—it has the defect of being a foreign product. It leaves us passive and subservient to something outside our own experience. It always fails to express our nationality, but it carries with it a persistent tendency to Americanize public sentiment, to cram down Canadian throats a type of character with which the Canadian does not sympathize and to impose upon Canadian youth an attitude, a rather Smart-Aleck attitude, towards both language and life. It involves the continuous danger of denationalization. It leaves us parasites and passive in a most vital cultural issue, and the mere toleration of un-Canadian sentiments like the mere endurance of characters and situations that are exotic to us can have its fatal insidious effects, for it adds little to the richness of Canadian national life, for the children of the Maple Leaf sit in patient silence through those patriotic passages which George M. Cohan can so unctiously festoon with the Star Spangled Banner.

We share with the United States many of the social and economic problems of the century. We speak the same language and participate in the same business depressions, and with friendly and fraternal candor point out each other's weakness. But Canada is Canada and our flag is not the flag of the United States. The natural thing to do in such a dilemma would be to turn to England, to go back to our mother country and draw on the accummulated glories of the British stage from the sublimities of Shakespeare down to the smartness of George Bernard Shaw, but while duly grateful for the grandeur of the past even the colonist nurses a rather active appetite for the novelties of the present, and in his journey back to the imperial land he finds his path blocked again by the American manager. He discovers that Galsworthy and Shaw and Parker have not been thinking of their kindred beyond the sea as actively as they thought of the general terms of their American contracts, for it is still a fixed practice to throw Canada in with the United States when signing up with an American producer. The result is that Canadian audiences are denied the privilege of witnessing some 90 per cent of English stage successes until and unless presented to them through the kindly offices of Broadway. Even Cyril Maude when he toured Canada was compelled to undertake the tour through the booking office of Liebler Bros. of New York, and if they reach Toronto and Winnipeg and Vancouver a trifle flat and off colour, remember we are mere suburbanites on the milk routes of international amusement—(Laughter.) And if they are not enured with loyalty and applauded with determination we are also compelled to remember that they are not distinctly Canadian, that they are without the endearing homeliness and hominess which is achieved only through the academic effort and that they are without the zest and freshness most appealing to you and, above all—national.

But let us shut the door on that dark scene of the drama and movie and turn to the field of the actual literary effort—to the function of poetry, which can be produced without a booking syndicate and a five million dollar canning factory. But before closing that door let me remind you that there is a ray or two of hope. The problems I outlined are not problems peculiar to Canada. Other countries are facing them and trying to solve them. The degradation of the commercial theatre, for example, has given birth to a little theatre movement—a movement that is more and more permitting the hand of the amateur to carry on the torch of true dramatics, and Canada, I rejoice to say, is taking an active and honest part in this movement. (Hear, hear.)

But Canada, I am told, is proud of her authors and proud of her poets, though on more than one occasion, after bringing out a book, I stopped to wonder why pride should so express itself in wallops where it hurts most, but we now have a Canadian Authors Association and some magazines of our own, and an effort is being made to keep the Canadian author at home and not send himself across the line to luxuriate in the abysmal rootlessness of the expatriate. In the things of the mind as in the things of commerce an effort is being made to encourage and to justify a demand for the made-in-Canada label. You will become more proudly and more passionately Canadian. You are looking for something of your own, racy of the soil—something with the tang of Maple sap in it, something sinewed with the strength of the North. You cannot, of course, hope to produce a great Canadian novel over night. Our cousins across the line, with their population of one hundred million, are still forlornly looking for the great American novel, and remembering the age and character of this Dominion I very much doubt if you will ever have the great Canadian novel, for the author of any such master-piece would have to have the geographical restlessness of a Casey Jones and the lyric fervour of an Archibald Lampman and the diligence of an Arnold Bennett and the humour of a Cervantes and the realism of a Zola and the fantasticism of a Wilson MacDonald and the scholarship of a Charles G. D. Roberts. But if and when that great Canadian novel comes along, I hope you will remember the trail blazers and the sod breakers, the men who proceeded the masters, for they are the pioneers—the pioneers of the pen, just as there have been pioneers of the plough, and it takes courage and insight and power to blaze a literary trail throughout a new country. It is easy to follow in the footsteps of others. It is easy to grow romantic about a country already festooned with romance and find glamour where a hundred voices have already rhapsodized over it, but the man who first writes a novel that interprets to you the bigness and beauty of your wondrous prairies, for instance, must both be a good Canadian and a good artist. (Hear, hear.) For Canada is a great and growing nation, and a great and growing nation must have a great and growing voice. It must be a voice of your own, and not the borrowed voices that come to you with the cultured emptiness of the literary ventriloquist who lives in one country and directs his voice at the purse strings and heart strings of another, and that does not mean me either. (Laughter.) In so far as this country is alert and aspiring she must be vocal and self-expressing. It is an inside job, and your authors themselves want something more than pink teas and a pat on the back and that parochialism which is proud of second best work, just because it is a local product. They want a market, because unless you belong to today you have a slim chance of belonging to tomorrow. They want a working wage. They want wool enough to cover their backs, no matter how they keep humping to cover themselves with glory, but before they can do that they must be recognized as part of your national life. They must be given a new and adequate copyright law to begin with. Their property rights must be defined and respected, and they must be regarded as the abstracts and brief chronicles of their times, and after your death better have a bad epitaph than their ill report. And since the finite word, which is also the finished word, must come from these same chroniclers, lean the closer to those who are giving their lives to express what they live and know, whether they speak in stone or form or phrase—lean closer if they are the interpreters of your soul, and in showing them you have a soul you will create not only an art and a literature of your own but an audience to breathe back into that art and that literature the breath of national life. I thank you. (Great applause.)

THE IMPERIAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

An Address by

HONORABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON.

Tuesday, April 19, 1932

Lieut.-Colonel George A. Drew, President, introduced the speaker, who was cheered on rising.

Hon. Mr. Ferguson: I assure you that I appreciate very greatly the warmth of your reception here to-day. Had I the time, I should like to tell you how constantly the thoughts of my wife and myself turn toward Canada, and particularly toward Ontario where we spent so many active and happy years, and how constantly we treasure the many friendships we formed and which we will cherish all the days of our lives. But that is not for me to discuss to-day.

You will recall, as your President has said, that the chief purpose in my going to the Old Country as High Commissioner for Canada was in the hope that I might be able to interpret to the British people, to the advantage of the Empire, Canadian spirit and Canadian ambitions, and at the same time, perhaps, contribute in a small way towards promoting the economic interests of the Empire as a whole, bringing about closer co-operation amongst the various sections of it.

During my abandonment of party politics I must be careful that I do not trespass on forbidden ground, so I cannot discuss questions of policy with you to-day. There are many things I should like to say. (Laughter.) These matters of policy and the settlement of economic problems are matters for governments when the conference gets together.

I thought that I might tell you something of the impressions I have gained during my sojourn in Great Britain, and of the opportunities I have had of observing closely the British people, the British outlook and the British attitude toward the Dominions. You know we have always shared the view—at least I had and I think most of you have—that in merchandising the Englishman is a sort of stupid fellow, and we are always complaining when he comes here to sell goods that he doesn't sell or bring us what we want to buy or in the form in which we want to purchase, and there is a good deal of ground for that complaint. One must remember that for centuries they have pursued one method of operation, and, one might say, almost one type of product. But I have learned since I went to England that we are just as bad in that respect as the Englishman.

We are sending goods of all kinds, products of this country, to England, expecting the British people to clamour for them, and we don't serve them up in the form they want them.

The three great defects in connection with our trade with Great Britain, and which have been existent for some time are, as I have said, the lack of appreciation of the consumer's taste and his desire to have the article given to him in the form in which he wants it. The second is a complete want of standardization of quality of products. New Zealand, South Africa, Australia—and California, if you will—almost every country shipping goods to England, except Canada, has a standard and a brand that spells quality, and we lack in that respect. Then, the third, and, I think, perhaps the most lamentable weakness of the whole situation is our lack of continuity of supply, not marketing our products over and over and over again.

It has come to me through our Trade Commissioners—for we have a half dozen or more very bright, active, young Canadians furthering British trade all over the

British Isles—that when they promote some particular product of importance to us, perhaps the purchaser is able to buy at once and cannot get the product again for months. Nobody can undertake to say that we can continue to supply these goods. Perhaps that could be cured. I have ventured to suggest that some authority should be taken at Ottawa to regulate in some orderly way the forwarding of our goods to the market in the British Isles.

We can remove those difficulties. We have to-day all the desire and the goodwill and the anxiety of the British people to buy Empire Goods. When they had their Empire Shopping Week a few months ago it was: "Buy Empire Goods from Home and Overseas", and that spirit prevails to-day in Great Britain as it never has before. I venture to say that those of you who have occasion to visit the Old Land periodically over a number of years will be much impressed with the complete change of British sentiment toward closer co-operation with the Dominions, the new outlook on the Empire's future that has taken place there within the past very few years and particularly within the past year or two. So, we have everything to hope for and we should be inspired with confidence when we get together and discuss in a frank, friendly, broad spirit the problems that have to be dealt with. We should be able to reach conclusions that will be of great value to us as well as to the Empire as a whole.

I think, perhaps, the evidence of the present attitude of the British Empire towards economic unity, towards closer co-operation between the various Dominions and the Motherland, is to be found in her policy, her attitude in legislation and administration during the past six months. You will recall that when she was being flooded with imports, in their wisdom the government decided that they would apply abnormal import legislation to prevent dumping in England or any part of Great Britain, and that legislation was passed and regulations to this effect were applied. But it was provided that they should not apply to any of the Dominions—that the Dominions are at liberty to dump—if they will, they may—all the goods they want into Great Britain, while they said to foreign countries: "You are restrained in the amount of imports we are going to take from you."

That is a remarkable step, indicating in a practical way the desire of the government and the British people, because that sentiment to-day is almost universal from end to end of the British Isles.

And then, a more remarkable thing: when they applied the ten per cent. tariff it was announced that it was a revenue tariff. They were seeking by every effort to accomplish the vital object of balancing their budget, and since they must have revenue, they applied, for the first time in almost a hundred years, a tariff of ten per cent. on all imports that were brought into Britain. But they said, "This shall not apply to the Dominions until we have a chance to sit down and talk it over."

And so you will find in their legislation that until the Conference takes place and a genuine effort is made to reach a conclusion that will be satisfactory, there will be no import duties applied against any of the Dominions or Protectorates of the British Isles. What greater evidence could one want that the Old Mother Country is seeking to gather about her the members of the family in closer unity than ever before? And day after day, Gentlemen, foreign countries are sending envoys and plenipotentiaries and delegates to the British Government, seeking to effect some trade arrangement, seeking to arrive at some commercial agreement which perhaps, will be of advantage to Great Britain. But what has been the answer of the British Government? "Until we have had a family conference amongst ourselves and have decided what is best for the Empire and ourselves, we don't intend to discuss any trade relations with any foreign country."

When one lives in an atmosphere like that, as I have been doing for the past twelve or fourteen months, is it any wonder one's admiration and confidence in the character and devotion of the British people is increased a thousand fold to what it was?

Some people in England say that they regard this conference as not only of great importance but as vital. You have read the speeches of Mr. Baldwin, President of the Council, who says that the Empire has come to the crossroads. One road leads to Empire unity, consolidation, and expansion, and the other leads to disintegration and ruin.

Mr. Chamberlain, Chancellor of the Exchequer, has said more than once that the Conference will mark the beginning of a new era in the history and development and influence of the British Empire.

And so you read the statements of all the leading men, the men who control public affairs and direct public opinion, and you find there is the one note of confidence, the one note of optimism, the one note sounded in favour of extending, if you will, the boundaries of the British Isles to take in her outlying possessions and her Dominions. That is the way they regard this conference. They hope to see a unification in which we will move forward in world history, marching shoulder to shoulder with a single purpose and that, I believe, will be the outcome of the Conference that is to be held here in Canada next July. (Applause.)

They go so far—many outstanding men in Great Britain—as to discuss openly the question of an Empire currency. I am not an economist—I am not even a financial expert—despite what some people say (Laughter.)—but I do know that there is a frequently expressed feeling among men in important positions, men whose views and opinions are highly regarded, that something should be done to fix a special relation between the dollar and the pound. For example—to make my meaning clear to those listening outside—if the pound is fixd again, I am quite sure from what I have heard that it will never be fixed at $4.86. It will probably be at $4.00. So it won't matter whether you deal in pounds in

Australia or in dollars in Canada there will be a parity of value.

Whether this is possible or not, I can't say. If I had my friend Sir Joseph Flavelle or Sir Thomas White in the corner for a while, they would tell me. But I do know that there is in evidence on the part of the people of Great Britain a desire to make it possible and easier to trade with ourselves and develop the various sections of our Empire.

Another thing that has impressed me very greatly is the fact that the British people to-day, and the British industrialists and business men generally, recognize that the Dominions are entitled to develop their own secondary industries. The day when we were looked upon as colonies from which they drew natural wealth and raw material to fabricate within their own island has passed. They recognize with great seriousness that they will never build a great Empire unless they give all the same chance and that Canada, Australia and other Dominions are entitled to and should be encouraged in the building up of strong industries all over the country.

There has been a remarkable change in that respect, and when we get together, having common ideas on these broad plains, I can't for the life of me see why we should not make very definite advances toward the objective we all have in mind.

But I should like to say this to-day: Don't let us expect too much at this Conference. Think of the enormous extent of the problem and the variety of its factors. It is utterly unthinkable that you can sit down in six or eight weeks and frame a tariff or reciprocal relationship that is going to cover every item handled by all these various Dominions and the British Isles herself. It can't be done. If you start to do that sort of thing you might better never have a Conference. It is sure to break down. I think from what I gather from my discussions with people over there, they hope they will lay down some broad fundamental principles, and that we may be able to deal with certain important items.

You know that eighty-five per cent. of our trade is made up of about fifteen items, and if we can deal with many of those we can lay the fundamentals upon which we can build as time goes on. Because this is only the first Conference of this kind—this is only the first that is going to succeed, and we must go on periodically holding these Imperial Conferences if we expect in the end to get the maximum of success and advantage out of trade relations within the Empire. So I say, don't be disappointed if your factory doesn't get some stimulus out of it, or if your particular business dosen't improve immediately. Let us clear the way, lay down fundamental principles, and then build from that on.

I think, from my discussions with Australian people, with New Zealanders, with those of South Africa and even with our Irish friends, with whom I manage to maintain friendly relations, I think we are all of one mind in that respect. And we are not expecting to accomplish everything at one sitting.

I have some notions of my own—(I thought I heard Sir Joseph Flavelle whisper: 'You usually have!') (Laughter.) But I really believe this: If we will approach this problem not upon the exclusive principle, if I may put it that way, do not let us begin with our chief aim that we want to exclude people from trading with us, even if they are foreigners. We have to maintain foreign contacts and credits, we have to have international relationships. But let us look at the problem from the other angle—the inclusive principle. Gather in all we can of our own people. All can establish exchanges of advantage to the whole. If it were possible for each Dominion to hang on the wall an economic map showing its exports and imports, and if by studying these maps we find we are importing a product from somewhere which we might import from Australia with advantage, or from Great Britain, let us see if we can't shift that trade. In other words, let us readjust our channels of trade as far as it is economically possible to do it within the Empire.

If we start out with that principle in mind, I am quite sure, from talks I have had with peopel who know infinitely more about these subjects than I do, that we would achieve a very great deal. (Applause.)

Another thing that spells success, as I see it, is the strength and personnel of the delegates who are coming to Canada. I doubt—at any rate it is not within my knowledge—if there has ever attended any Conference a delegation consisting of such a number of outstanding public figures as are going to attend this Conference. When you get Mr. Baldwin, former leader of a Government, their former Chancellor of the Exchequer, leading business men in Great Britain—Mr. Thomas, whom we all know in Canada—and Mr. Runciman, President of the Board of Trade, a recent convert from free trade, (who said in the House of Commons that he hadn't given up his free trade principles—he had them as strong as ever—but the difficulty was that in the present economic situation of the world they didn't apply anywhere)—Mr. Runciman is coming. He is an exceedingly able man. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, the outstanding Imperial figure in England, Mr. Neville Chamberlain is coming. Also, Sir Phillip-Culiffe Lister, a very able man who was formerly President of the Board of Trade, an office which, as you know, is analagous to our Ministry of Trade and Commerce. In addition, one of the broadest minded men in the British Isles will attend the Conference—Lord Hailsham, formerly Sir Douglas Hogg. There will be very few left in England—except the office boy. (Laughter.) That is an indication of the importance and the seriousness with which they regard this meeting. They look upon it not only as a conference, but as the initial conference out of which results are going to come, and they want the world at large to be impressed with the idea that not only the outlying sections of the Empire but the old Mother Country herself, regards it as one of the most important features in her whole history, her whole national life. (Applause.)

You know they are funny people over there. But they are the most remarkable people in the world. They have a character that is to be found nowhere else that I know of. Last summer the Chancellor announced that a huge deficit seemed inevitable in the Budget. You recall that they borrowed eighty million pounds to try and save the pound from being knocked off its perch—the gold standard. Confidence in English and British stability began to wane, and it ran to the extent of almost a panic and foreign countries all over the world having monies and investments in Great Britain began to withdraw them and gold—not only her own but the gold she had borrowed—was disappearing so rapidly that they had to abandon the gold standard because they were paying for the goods they were buying in gold, and for what they were selling they were getting dogs and cats or anything else in the shape of depreciated currency. They went off the gold standard.

Since that a very marked change has taken place in conditions. The present Chancellor, some time in November, I think it was, or in the first part of December, announced that if before a certain date he could collect seventy-five per cent. of the income taxes, he would be able to balance the national budget. I was going down the Strand one day, looking down Somerset Lane. I saw a queue of a hundred, perhaps two hundred, people. I knew there was no Labour Exchange or Dole Office down there, so I asked somebody what it was. It was the Income Tax Office with the queue of people waiting to pay their income taxes. They had sold their watches, their jewels, and had borrowed money to save the Empire. That is the spirit behind it all! They got no discount for doing it. And within the period suggested by Mr. Chamberlain, he got not only his seventy-five per cent.—he got eighty-two per cent. And then they issued a cheque quietly one day and sent it to the United States and said: "There is all we owe you for some time. It is true it is not due for four months yet, but we have the money and you may as well have it if you need it."

That is a most remarkable performance and the spirit behind it all is devotion to the national institutions and to the Sovereign. (Loud applause.)

Then money began to come back. Everybody wanted to deposit in England. Every foreign dollar taken out was put in again until the bank rate was cut in three or four months from seven per cent. to three and a half. They have so much money they don't know what to do with it. Things have readjusted themselves so rapidly that confidence all over the world has been re-established in Great Britain, and Great Britain, Gentlemen, will be the first country to come back to normal conditions in all the world, and it is due to the genius, the courage and the character of British citizens. I tell you it makes me proud, and it should make every one of us proud, of the fact that we are entitled to call ourselves British subjects and live under the aegis of the British Flag. (Cheers.)

Taxation! Taxation all over the world is burdensome. Revenues have fallen away; buying power has diminished and governments, municipalities and businesses are not earning what they formerly did. The money to operate public services must be obtained some way, and there is no other way except through taxation. That is a world wide situation. But compare our taxes—there may not be much consolation in this, but it sometimes helps me—compare our taxes with those in our Mother Land, where they are cutting up estates and selling portions of their land to pay taxes. There, if you are an unmarried man and earning over $600 a year, they take twenty-five per cent., and if you are married and earning over $750. they take twenty-five per cent., and as it goes up you pay super taxes.

The taxes are enormous. An English friend of mine told me the other day that his wife had an income of eleven hundred pounds from some property which she owned and by the time she got through paying income taxes and super taxes and local rates and insurance, she had the neat sum of two hundred and forty-two pounds out of eleven hundred pounds. That is, perhaps, an extreme case, but it is typical of the situation.

And the remarkable feature of it is that in Great Britain they always just go jogging along, saying the sun is just below the horizon; we are going to get through. And everybody is co-operating in England, not with any party spirit or desire for advantage, one over the other, but with a determination that England is going to maintain her position in the world, and if we get more of that spirit abroad throughout the Empire, by joining hands with a single purpose and with great ideals, believing as we do, that British supremacy and leadership is best for the world; that her security and the security she guarantees to everyone is the ideal condition under which her people live; if we believe in these principles, we as Canadians, aye, those all over this Empire, can't help but thrill with the thought that we have the opportunity coming to us next summer of sitting down together—generously—not with any selfish bargaining spirit,—but with a desire to build up, we can strengthen and better the greatest force for good the world has ever known. (Loud cheers.)

EMPIRE TRADE REQUIRES UNIFORM STANDARDS

AN ADDRESS BY CHARLES D. LE MAISTRE, C.B.E.,

Friday, April 29, 1932.

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEO. A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

MR. LEMAISTRE: This is, as you may well imagine, a very great pleasure to be here once again in Toronto, and it is indeed a great honour as well as a privilege to have this opportunity of addressing so many eminent professional and business men.

Now, you will not expect me in the short time at my disposal to traverse the whole field of standardization; it is vast, and its ramifications extend equally as the ramifications of industry itself does. However, before entering upon the important subject of my mission to the Dominions, I think it may be well to spend a few moments giving, for the information of those who are entirely unfamiliar with this subject, what we in the old country understand by standardization, and particuarly industrial standardization.

Now, you all know that many years ago it became absolutely imperative to establish standards of weights, and standards of lengths, and, more recently, standards by which you can measure your electric light and power bills, and in those countries which use gas as an illuminant, your gas bills. Those are quite rightly established by the various governments and maintained with the utmost precision by them; in fact, as you will all realize, our life would be chaotic without them.

Now, we look upon those as fundamental standards. Industrial standards can themselves be divided quite reasonably and easily into two main categories, one dealing wth dimensions, and the other with the quality of materials and performance of machinery.

With regard to the dimensionals: it is enormously important where interchangeability of component parts of machinery is involved to have that dimensional standardization; you have only to look to the marvelous success of the motor car industry—the automobile industry—to see where their services would be without standardization. But, mark you, that is individual and not national. I came here to speak about the national standardization.

But dimensional standardization has not gone very far, it is true, nationally, but there are a few rather important exceptions. For instance, you realize the sizes of steel shapes or sections or beams. In point of fact, the very first piece of work which our organization did when it was very small, thirty years ago, was started because the steel merchants of London—amongst them some engineers—realized that they had an immense amount of capital locked up in their stocks because of the tremendous variety of steel shapes, and there was undertaken a rationalization and a standardization which saved and has saved millions of pounds. Think of what was done in war time when our Admiralty took away 114 standard sections and cut them down to 11 or 13, and built all of the ships with those.

There is another line, that of nuts and bolts. It is true it is not international, but in your country they are standardized. Moreover, consider the gas mantles, and electric lamps as being standardized. Does anybody ever go and buy an electric lamp and hire an electrician to help him put it into the electric socket? Does anybody buy a gas mantle and not expect it to go on the gas bracket? No.

And then in the latest invention of all, which makes it possible for people to hear a speech sitting quietly in their own room, at their luncheon, or their dinner, or in their easy chair; does anybody have the slightest difficulty with—we call them "valves"; you call them "tubes"? No. They go into your wireless sets with the greatest of ease. All of that is due to standardization. The trouble is the housewives have taken it for granted, and they have not the ghost of a notion of the tremendous amount of time and money and trouble expended before that was possible. Indeed, many of the inventions to-day we could not use if it were not for standardization.

Now, manufacturers, as you will agree, in every country are inclined not to manufacture a great quantity in too great a variety, and certainly a certain amount of rationalization is required. Of course, when you go purchasing you want to exercise your choice, but not such a great choice that you will be entirely confused. We do not all of us want to live in houses furnished with furniture of identical pattern; we do not want all of us to have clothing of identical pattern, nor even boots of one and the same type. No. We want to exercise our own individual choice, and we do not want it standardized so that it will prevent us from doing that. So we may say we do not in England look upon standardization as meaning, for instance in the automobile trade, the joining together of all the forms of motor cars into two camps, one the Rolls Royce, and the other a very cheap car for the majority, where the Rolls Royces would be bought by the millionaires and the talking picture artists, and the workers would have the rest.

Nor do we understand by "standardization" the amalgamation of all the mills of Yorkshire and Lancashire, so that very economically cloth would be made of one pattern, and all be dressed alike, like the army, and as they are trying to do in Russia. No. By industrial standardization we understand the bringing together of various branches of industry in a spirit of mutual concession, to unify and simplify their requirements on the basis of the community interest of the purchaser and the producer. That is the corner stone of the whole of our work, the community interest of the purchaser and the producer.

Now, the national movement for standardization in Great Britain was started some thirty years ago by an engineer who had the foresight to see that in order that the movement should be successful it must be based on the community of interest which I have just mentioned, of the purchaser and the producer. Moreover, that it must have the fullest governmental support in order that it might have the necessary authority throughout the country, and lastly, that no section of the community should be able to dominate any other section of the community; in fact, that the recognition should be arrived at by practical consent. Moreover, none of our work is undertaken on the suggestion of an individual, so there are not any dangers of over-standardization. The work is only undertaken after a conference with all the parties concerned, having given a consensus of opinion that such work would be valuable to industry.

By "industry" I do not mean the manufacturers alone; I mean the manufacturers and the purchasers. So that when I am speaking of industry please understand I do not mean only the manufacturers, but I mean the community of interest of all.

In setting up any committee to undertake this kind of work our organization is always particularly careful that all people who consider they have the right to give their views shall be notified from the very commencement and invited to cooperate in this work—not individually, but representatively. The fact is that in Great Britain, since the war, industry has become very highly organized, and largely because of this we have been enabled to arrive by common consent at a yet inconsiderable series of what are known as British standard specifications, for the quality of material, and for the performance of machinery and apparatus.

Now, the engineers have been public-spirited enough to go one step further and to open the doors to the whole trade of the country, so that our orangization, which was recently known as the British Engineering Standards Association, is now known as the British Standard Institution, and moreover, the engineers have agreed that all the other great trade interests of the country shall participate on an equal basis in the government of the organization.

We now have four great sections dealing with engineering, dealing with the great chemical interests of the country, dealing with the whole of the building interests, and also with the textiles, and each of these great interests by the processes which are laid down in our by-laws, elect, each of them, nine members to our general council, and in addition we have government representatives of research, the Federation of British Industries, and the Associated Chambers of Commerce. Of course, the engineering work will continue entirely untramelled, as it was formerly. By the long experience we have gained in this engineering work, we have discovered little by little the peculiar technique, because after all, standardization is 85 per cent. human, and it is the human factor which is the most refractory part of the work. We know all of the laws of technique. In fostering this great development of this organization with its widened field, the engineers have not been blind to advantages to themselves and the others, so that we have one central coordinating influence throughout the whole country in this work of standardization. It is no more than the coordinating influence, because each of these great sections of industry have complete technical autonomy in carrying out their work under the general council, which is the liason between them all.

Now, there are great organizations in the great self-governing dominions, particularly in Australia, similar to the one we have in the home country, but they are directly under the aegis of the Government, or in closer touch with it, and they are all preparing national standard specifications, that is national purchasing specifications, because that is exactly what they are. From the result of this very highly organized cooperation between the producers and the consumers, and the technical officers of the Government we have between 400 and 500 working on our committees, and research department and other experts. We have, as you have here, admirable men in the teaching line, professors in the University, whose advice is invaluable so long as the dear men do not control the situation. (Laughter.)

Now these national purchasing specifications are extremely valuable to industry, because they provide for competitive tenders. This gives the manufacturers the protection of fair dealing between each other, because they are all on the same basis. They give a satisfactory, economically-obtained quality of material and so satisfy the consumers. Now, they in no way interfere with invention and design. Moreover, they are kept entirely up to modern practises by the safeguards, most rigidly applied, of periodic review and revision where it is necessary. The great desire of my Council is that never shall an industry obtain the advantage of this organization and have the British standard specifications covering their material or product, and then sit down and say, "We need not bother any more; these purchasing specifications are in the hands of all purchasers and purchasing authorities throughout the country; they are obliged to adopt them; the government makes them, so we need not trouble any more." That is absolutely avoided by the fact that this committee is always based on the community of interests of the purchaser and the producer. I need not go into that. It is quite obvious what that means.

Moreover, these specifications are of very great use in this way; that they protect the workers and the public, because they supply a reasonable quality of material and machinery, and so minimize accidents. Also—and perhaps this is one of the very most important aspects and values of the specifications—they stabilize employment, because they enable manufacturers to manufacture stock in slack times. Now, I will give you two examples, one where it helps workers.

Some two years ago, or perhaps a little more, our home office, which looks after the safety of the workers under the Factory Act, found that the fatal accidents due to faulty material in the travelling cranes employed throughout the country were rising, and they knew that something had to be done, either restrictive legislation had to be introduced into Parliament—and then do you not see the happy feeling of the Minister who is being asked questions (laughter)—or industry should put its own house in order. But how? So they turned to our organization, and they gave me the confidential report in order that I might make myself fully acquainted with all these details. Now there is a long story there, because to introduce the spirit of cooperation into an industry, the representatives of these manufacturers having never been in the same room together, is no easy task. But we have succeeded and a British standard specification for the materials and the workmanship in those cranes—without touching the design or preventing invention or progress—has been adopted by the whole of the crane industry of the country, and been made obligatory after a certain date by the Home Office. How far better it is that industry should put its own house in order in that way, and what a wonderful thing it is to see those men, and there are a good number of them, meeting together, putting their feet under the same table, and agreeing. In that way far more is accomplished than often is represented by the British Standard Specifications. That is particularly a community of interest, and they have begun to realize how much better it is to have intelligent cooperation than destructive competition.

Now, with regard to stabilized employment. Our quarries masters have been for some years in a troubled state because up and down the country every civil engineer who had under his jurisdiction some portion of our main roads had different ideas of what should be the shape or length of the granite curb which faces our great roads, so that the poor quarries have the greatest difficulty to meet their orders, and at other times have had to get rid of half of their men.

They went to our Minister of Transport, and the Minister of Transport sent them to us, and again by the same sort of process of getting both the spirit of co-operation in the industry and a fully representative committee which was formed after conference, we immediately began to make progress. We had the Ministry of Transport engineers; representatives from all the municipalities, from the corporations, from the Government, from the trade organization, from the federations; in fact, from everybody who felt that they had the right to be heard in this matter, and they also had expert men who had studied the right forms of these granite curbs to be employed on these new forms of roads, and the result has been a British standard specification for granite curbs. The Minister of Transport is perfectly happy and says to all the municipalities "Here is the British Standard specification; use it". There is also this push; few of the municipalities are doing anything in the way of road construction which do not have to appear at the door of the Treasury for a loan, and the Treasurer is in the office of the Minister of Transports, and the Minister of Transports says, "Yes, of course we will help, but all of the material will be in accordance with the British Standard Specifications". That has brought stabilized employment throughout the quarries in the home country.

I could go on for a very long time and give you such examples, but I must hasten on.

British export trade is its great preoccupation at the moment, and they are recognizing that in order to extend it, indeed to maintain the markets we already have, complete satisfaction must be given to its customers, and that they must meet, so far as possible economically, the requirements of our overseas customers. (Applause.)

Now these national purchasing specifications, from our experience, are proving to be one of the most effective means of attaining that object. I ought to say--and you will I think realise it—that the British Government for some considerable time now has been making a great drive throughout the whole country in favour of the adoption of British Standards by all purchasing departments in every walk of life. Every Government Department has instructions from the Cabinet to employ wherever possible and practicable the standard specifications, and where they do not exist, to ask for them. Of course, there are still, in government purchases, a few cases where you cannot get away from the proprietary articles, but in a larger majority of cases in the future, as in the present—but more in the future—great purchases will be in accordance with British Standard Specifications.

Now, our desire at the last Imperial Conference was to coordinate the efforts of the National Standardizing bodies, and we ought probably to say here that there is not the slightest desire on the part of Great Britain, as represented through our British Standards Institution, in the least degree to force British standards on to the Dominion. We recognize in Great Britain the essential prosperity of your secondary industries, and what we desire is by this intelligent cooperation, as against individualism run riot, to obtain the mutual concessions, and a give and take basis which can be mutually helpful in the expansion of each others trade within this great Empire of ours.

Of course, coordination is just as important to the Dominions as it is to the home country, and fortunately I find that there is a growing recognition of the absolute necessity of complete understanding of each others requirements, because without this understanding, varying local habits and conditions impose almost insuperable difficulties to the satisfactory development of inter-Empire trade.

Now, it is in order to promote just this coordination that I have been sent to the Dominions, in the first place, to learn something of their trade requirements, and to assure the Dominions that we in Great Britain desire to the utmost, as I have just said, to meet the Dominions' requirements where we economically can. Moreover, we desire to cooperate with the Dominions' standardizing bodies in order that by drawing up joint national purchasing specifications we may open new markets for reciprocal trade.

Now, take Australia, that land of sunshine, where I am afraid, if you are in the least like I was, one looks to Australia and sees New South Wales, and judges the whole of Australia unfortunately by New South Wales. They say in Australia that New South Wales is the oldest settlement of the Commonwealth, and the least inclined to settle (laughter), and having been there for a couple of months, I am enormously impressed with the tremendous future of that magnificent country, and we stand in respect and awe of the marvelous progress those people have made in the short time they have been there. We have only to go to Australia to feel the wonderful affection they one and all have for the Old Country. (Applause.)

Now, I found there the greatest sympathy and interest in this idea, which emanated from the 1930 Imperial Conference Committee on standardization. I find in some Dominions that it is hardly known. There is the report, it is public, and it ought to have been known by the whole of industry in all the Dominions. Perhaps I might say there that because of the silent revolution going on in industry and elsewhere in the Old Country, and the pressure of economic events, we are much more ready in the Old Country to change to new ideas and new processes and procedures, particularly when they have the backing of scientific facts, than the Dominions are inclined to feel and appreciate.

In Australia the Government gave me the fullest support and recognized the tremendous trade value of these national purchasing specifications and what they can do for the improvement and development of Empire Trade, and I hope Mr. Bruce will be one of the delegates to the Ottawa Conference, as he is very much imbued with the importance of this side of the conference work.

In New Zealand I found the same thing. The Prime Minister showed his own personal interest by taking the chair at a very representative meeting in Wellington after I had spoken throughout the country, and they have given effect to the desires of the Imperial Conference by the appointment of a central committee to work in direct communication with our institution in London. (Applause.)

Now, each of these national bodies is drawing up an immense number of these standard specifications, and a large number of them are of a purely local interest but the others—a certain number of them which require proper analysis—are susceptible either to collateral coordination either between that Dominion and the home country or between one Dominion and the other, and will be invaluable when they are coordinated for the assistance of inter-Empire trade.

I will give you just one example. In one of the Dominions I found that the Old Country had lost the trade in raw materials which went to the manufacture of quite the most important industry in that Dominion, and I made it my business to find out why. It was quite simple. Neither the quality of the material or its consistency was in the least satisfactory. They had tried, as they said, until they were almost crazy to get what they wanted, but they did not seem to be able to do so; either through distance or misunderstanding or individual effort, but they desire to purchase within the Empire, in this case, from the home country. So I said to them, "You have a Central Committee; we have a Central Committee; if your industry through that Committee will ask my organization to get in touch with the manufacturers—and they are already in my organization—we will without any serious difficulty on this basis of the community of the interest of the purchaser and producer draw up a joint national purchasing specification to remedy the whole situation. You will purchase; you will get what you want; you will be able to compare the tenders you receive; the manufacturers will know exactly your requirements; they will all be on the same basis, and you will be assured of a reasonable quality, and you will get the trade back."

Now, if I should come closer home to you, there is your timber industry. It is getting a little late, so I will not go into it with too much detail. I have gone into that question, and I am glad to say that the timber industry in this country is fully alive to the possibilities opening through their cooperative effort as against individual effort. Individual effort is quite useful, but can you imagine any individual coming to Great Britain as a salesman and technician? You yourselves cannot expect us to send you a salesman and have you take at the face value the technique he gives you in support of his salesmanship, but get a representative committee, get the support of, for instance, the Forest Products Bureau and the similar organizations, to cooperate with us in our country and you will get technical data that is entirely above suspicion, like Caesar's wife, and we accept it at once, a national purchasing specification is drawn up by mutual agreement.

And here is the value to Canada; that is automatically accepted by the purchasers throughout the country, and at once all of the misunderstandings are removed, and the salesman then can take your joint national purchasing specifications and the authorization, and say, "I want to see you, because I want to sell you wood on the basis of a specification you yourself have accepted and drawn up".

We consider that kind of procedure is one of the most useful methods which industry can adopt throughout the Empire. Of course, the problem of getting people together to agree is not a simple one, as anybody who has had anything to do with that kind of work knows, but the machinery is there, the procedure is there, and with all the good will and desire to agree, and the economic pressure behind us makes it imperative that we should agree, and surely it is not past the wit of men and the intelligence there is throughout the Empire, to come to the most useful scheme which will go a long way to put us on our feet again.

Of course, it is no good going forward and saying "In the Old Country they will never get their purchasing authorities to alter their habits; their architects would not change," but as I said just now, we are far more ready to change than you people in the Dominions realize.

Now, if Great Britain has been sending unsuitable material and goods to the Dominions, I think I am safe in saying that the Dominions also have in certain cases been sending quite unsuitable goods, unsuitably packed, to Great Britain, so that we are all in the same boat. However, there is a growing recognition of the absolute necessity of a complete and clear understanding with regard to these matters. You know, misunderstandings occur fearfully easily. I know of a case of a naval cadet who was asked to write a thesis on "Compulsory service", and he said he did not know much about it, but he did feel there was one thing everyone would agree with, that boys at any rate should be compelled to attend one divine service each Sunday. (Laughter.) Now, I have said nothing can promote this complete understanding so well as systematized cooperation of industry and trade, under the aegis of these national standardizing bodies, for the issue of these joint national purchasing specifications. The wisdom of industry coming under the aegis of these national standardizing bodies, so far as our country is concerned, is being abundantly proven, and such enlightened cooperation will go far to remove the painful effect of destructive competition, and minimize misunderstandings, and promote fair dealings between the manufacturers individually, and not only that, but between manufacturers as a whole, and their customers overseas.

Now, I am coming to the close of a most intensely interesting mission. The British Government has sent me all around the Dominions, and, as I said a little while ago, I am tremendously impressed with the wonders that have been done throughout the Dominions. I am enormously pleased, not only with the cordial reception I have received everywhere, largely because of what we represent, but with that sense of affection for the Old Country that there is throughout the Dominions, and how proud one is—more proud than ever one was before—to be a unit in this magnificent British Commonwealth of Nations, to share in the difficulties—and we are always at our best when we have our backs against the wall, as we have now. We have been through the war together, and we have learned to coordinate without losing our individuality, and now we are in the battle for prosperity. I see nowhere in the Dominions pessimism. Perhaps, as we call it in England, "Down under" they have such lovely sunshine they cannot be depressed. Let none of us be depressed; let us all look forward through this community of action and community of thought throughout the Empire which is going to be concentrated into this Ottawa Conference, and you will agree with me, that we have the most marvelous heritage and the most marvelous future before us all. (Prolonged applause.)

THE SCOTTISH TRADE MISSION

AN ADDRESS BY HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF MONTROSE, HONORARY PRESIDENT OF THE SCOTTISH TRADE MISSION.

Thursday, May 19, 1932

(Joint Meeting with The Canadian Club.)

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

THE DUKE OF MONTROSE: I can assure you on behalf of my colleagues of the Scottish Trade Mission, how deeply we appreciate the kind hospitality we are receiving during our short stay in Canada. Your hospitality has been overwhelming; it has been kindness personified. They say sometimes that Scotsmen "hae a grand conceit o' themselves." Well, gentlemen, if we are going to get receptions such as the one you have given us today, it is no wonder that we have swollen heads.

I might at this stage quote from our Scottish bard, Burns, "Would some power the giftie gie us, to see ourselves as others see us." I assure you we appreciate very much the welcome we have received here in Canada. They always say where there is a large number of Scotsmen you meet kindliness. I believe now that over two hundred thousand Scotsmen are now settled here in Canada, and I believe there is no other nation in the world which keeps up and holds out the hand of friendship in the same way as we do. You never hear of any other nation having a Burn's night or a St. Andrew's night, and you know on these occasions when Scotsmen foregather it is simply kindliness, a friendliness among themselves that makes these things take place. It is not always easy, some people say, to find a Scotsman when you want him. It is not always easy when you are in trouble to find a friend when you want one, but you can always find a Scotsman when you want to. You have only got to go to the nearest shipping port and put your head down in the engine room and shout out, "Hey Mac, have you got a corkscrew?" and then you will get a reply from the chief engineer at the bottom of the ship, "Aye, mon, I am comin'."

Mr. President kindly alluded to my visit here in Canada, but I can assure you I almost feel myself half a Canadian because the Scottish Trade Mission, of which I have the honour to be Honorary President, came over in the *Letitia,* the Scottish Trade Mission Ship. The *Letitia,* I might point out, is by no means the only trade mission ship that has come to Canada. I mean long ago, three hundred years ago, in the time of King James the First, there was a rumour came to Scotland that they were forming a new Spain, a new France, a new England, here in the great continent of America, and Sir William Alexander, a famous Scot, said at that time, "Why should there not be a new Scotland too?" And with the approval of King James he got together a certain number of enterprising Scottish traders and he sailed over here and landed on the shores of Nova Scotia and started a plantation, or rather, I should say, an overseas settlement, on these shores. As time went on, Nova Scotia prospered and the King of Scotland was so satisfied with the settlement that he created 120 knights of Nova Scotia among the gentlemen who had come over. He gave them the Order of Knighthood of Nova Scotia, and out of these 120 families there are only sixty families now in existence. All the other families have died out, some by natural death, but many on the battlefield by slaughter or other causes, and we in Scotland value the Order of the Knights of Nova Scotia almost more than any other Order. It is one of the few genuine old Scottish Orders which will never be added to. All other orders are added to by the Sovereign of the country, but the old Scottish Order of Nova Scotia will never be added to. As time goes on it will become more valuable. My family happens to be one of those still in existence in Nova Scotia. There you see the old yellow ribbon of Scotland, the colour which you see in the old Scottish Standard, and we pass this order on proudly as an heirloom from father to son, and as I say, as families die out it will become more valuable; like old wine it will improve with age. (Applause.)

Then, gentlemen, I have another connection here in Canada. Some one hundred years ago there were considered to be too many people living in Scotland, too many people to maintain themselves. One hundred years ago our country was a very poor country. There were no roads one hundred years ago in Scotland—no roads at all. All communication was by horse or pony over steep and rocky mountain trails. The farmer in Scotland at that time only worked to feed himself and family, and there was nothing for export. If the harvest failed, they were face to face with starvation. In many lonely glens of Scotland, families were faced with poverty and destitution, and some of the wealthy farmers decided to send out some of the families. This was called "a clearance in the Highlands," and certainly did a great deal of good. But remember, gentlemen, these land owners did no more than what the Government are doing today in assisting emigration. They did exactly the same, and in my home where I come from, in the Island of Arran, the landlord of that date, the Duke of Hamilton, sent two lots of sixty families each and they settled not far from Guelph. My son, who was here five years ago as a harvester in the Canadian harvest, earning five dollars a day, went to this village and there he met the inhabitants, and the strangest thing was that on the morning he arrived the oldest person in the village, a woman of 97 years of age died, and this same old lady was the last person to be carried as a baby at the Island of Arran when these families sailed to this great country. He got a reception of the most enthusiastic description from these people. When he saw how well they were doing—when he saw them living in large homes and settled comfortably with an air of prosperity all around them, and when he thought of the barren and rocky place from which they came he could only say that the "clearance of the Highlands were after all a 'God send' ". (Applause.)

But, gentlemen, I have somewhat wandered from my subject. I must get back to our Trade Mission. We came over in a ship called the *Letitia* as a Trade Mission organized by my good friend Mr. Donaldson and others of the Anchor Donaldson Line, and a very efficient Mission ship it is. They say it is the largest and finest collection of goods brought on exhibit from any country in the world to your shores, and I know you have had other exhibitions before this. The *Letitia* nevertheless is considered one of the best mission ships at the present time. This idea of a mission ship is one likely to grow. You know how cruising has grown from quite a small beginning to quite a big enterprise to-day. This idea of a mission ship enables business men, business men of different countries, to see the manufactured goods of each. Traders come over and see how other manufacturers are doing business, and there is a friendly relationship established and from that results an increased trade. We believe that this is a thing which is going to grow and grow beneficially to our Empire. After all, gentlemen, it is our Empire and those of us in the United Kingdom intend to make the very best use of this idea of trade cruising. We built up our Empire and our great trade on our dependence on the sea. We are a maritime nation greater than all the countries in the world, and those of the British Empire are those who will stand again by carrying out trade missions by sea. We are not trying in the *Letitia* to sell over the counter. What we are trying to do is what your President mentioned, namely to get in direct touch with your leading buyers and manufacturers. We want to meet your best merchants and manufacturers. We want to meet your best merchants and manufacturers and to find out from them the best way to develop trade, in what way we can develop our trade to the largest possible extent, and, of course, by meeting you you can help us materially and we can also help you. We can show your people here the goods we are making—that is the quality of the goods we make, the goods we are making in Scotland to-day. You can examine them and tell us if they suit you. We have on board about eighty-seven stalls on which one hundred and forty different lines of manufactured goods are to be seen. We have also competent representatives to explain and discuss the business with any one who chooses to call, and I am satisfied to hear that we have had to turn several thousands of visitors away. We have had more than ten thousand people on board that ship to see our goods, and that in itself is an indication of the interest which the people of Canada are taking in our trade mission.

Nevertheless, gentlemen, I think we have been rather neglectful of Canada. Take your great Toronto Exhibition which you hold annually. I believe we take only ten per cent. accommodation for exhibits. When we take into consideration the fact that in other exhibitions, in other places in foreign countries, we occupy much more space for exhibits, then we are bound to ask ourselves if we are doing our duty. If we were doing our duty we would take the same amount of space as we take in an exhibition in any foreign country, for instance such as the Buenos-Aires Exhibition. We have failed to do that in the past, but I hope that as a result of your interest and the kindness which has been shown to us in that direction at the next Toronto Exhibition, or at least at the one after that, we will have on exhibit a much larger and better selection of goods than we have had in the past. I know people say what sort of goods can you give us, or exchange with us? Well, gentlemen, every one knows the quality of our coal. We believe that we can sell you a great lot more anthracite coal than we are at present doing. Then we believe we can sell you wool. We are very anxious to sell you our wool from our famous black sheep. It is very suitable for carpet making. You have here in Toronto several carpet manufacturers whom I am anxious to meet. We used to sell our wool to America, but we lost our market for various reasons and America is now buying from South America and we are trying to cultivate a trade with Canada. This wool is an important thing to our Scottish farmers and it is also important to you business men here in Canada, because if we in Great Britain have no market for our wool we cannot buy the modern agricultural implements which you manufacture.

What we say is this—if you buy our wool we shall be in funds to buy your agricultural implements. As things are now, nearly all our Scottish farmers have Canadian reapers, disc plows and other things, but more are required and we will not be able to buy these goods because we have no trade and we cannot sell our wool. We are too poor to buy these things. If we have interchange of trade, we shall be in a position to buy your agricultural implements. We say we would rather trade with you in the Dominion of Canada than in the United States, which has barred and bolted the door in our faces. If we build up our trade with you, it helps to give outward and inward trade to our ships. I think that my friend Mr. Donaldson will say—if you have outward and inward cargoes it enables the ships to give lower rates for transportation, and that means cheaper transport will give you greater facilities in foreign competition. You are anxious to sell your meat. We want to feed our Army and Navy and Air Force with meat from the Dominions. These services take 34 million pounds of meat a year. We wanted to place that contract for 34 million in the Dominions or the United Kingdom, but what happened? When we came to examining the prices we found that your prices worked out at ten cents per pound, and we were offered meat from the Argentine at seven cents per pound, and the policy that was enforced in the day that contract was made, made it necessary to buy in the cheapest market, and by doing so we saved $1,400,000 in feeding our forces. The question is how can we develop cheaper transport? Can Canada reduce her price by three cents in meat? If you can we will preferentially place the order with Canada for the meat supply of the home forces. And so it comes to this. It behooves us to do what we can to develop trade, and for that idea we are here in this great trade mission.

We have been through financial depression of the worst possible kind, possibly the worst in the world. We believe at home, however, that we have touched rock bottom. We believe that we have seen the worst; we have a kind of hopeful theory now in regard to the future. We believe that the time is ripe to try and lay the foundation for building up a new trade, a new business. That is why we are here in Canada to-day. We are determined to make an effort to cultivate this new market. You have lately, through your Chamber of Commerce, sent out a questionnaire to all the other chambers of commerce asking them to make suggestions for improving import and export trade for the United Kingdom. This was a valuable step to take, and if you will be kind enough to give us the result of that questionnaire, we Scots will follow out any advice you choose to give us, which I have no doubt will be of great material help to us in developing our trade. (Applause.)

Only one thing more, gentlemen, I need say to you. Some people say to me, "What is the good of you asking Canada to try and develop your trade, to try and develop trade with you? Canada does not want to do that. She wants to develop her own manufactures, her own industries, and she is afraid of the competition from the United Kingdom." We know that Canada has her own industries and manufactures that she wishes to develop, and we have no desire to interfere with the Canadian forms of industry. After all, we people in Scotland are not lunatics. (Laughter.) You know Canada is one of our best customers. You are taking £5 a head in trade from us, and the foreign people are only taking 12 shillings. Do you think that we shall be so silly as to try to kill our best customers? As I said, we are not lunatics. We are anxious that you should prosper, and we believe that when you prosper, your prosperity will be ours. It will help us to develop our trade. One of the most hopeful signs of the times is in the conference that is going to take place in Ottawa within the next few weeks, and we look forward with interest to the results of that conference. Our Labour representatives are now beginning to realize that it was wrong to take cognizance of the labour conditions in the United Kingdom alone. They are beginning to realize that, looking to the social welfare of the people as a whole, they must take cognizance of world labour conditions. They are beginning to realize that to go on protecting their own industries by trade union regulations alone, and paying not the slightest heed to what is going on in foreign countries, without making recognition of the conditions of labour which makes things cheap, they are doing the worst thing for social welfare; they are putting a premium on sweated goods. (Applause.) For this reason the foreign nations which have low wages, sweated labour, say that it is only by maintaining these low conditions of labour, these sweated conditions, that they can maintain their position in the British market, and therefore, if they are going to continue their hold on the British markets, they must preserve low conditions of labour which results in cheap goods. Our Labour party is recognizing this more and more. They are beginning to recognize that the preservation of this system of low wages and the manufacture of sweated goods is an injury to our own people, and rather than pull down the United Kingdom conditions, our idea is to bring them up. Our aim is to get rid of sweated goods made in foreign countries, and bring conditions in those foreign countries up to the same standard as exists in the United Kingdom. We have had too much cheap food and cheap manufacture of all descriptions, so cheap that they were below the cost of production. The result of all this was that we had two and a half millions of our people unemployed. Do you realize that we are spending $535,000,000 a year on unemployment, that this huge sum is being paid to young men and young women and heads of families, simply to walk the streets doing nothing. We could not go on like that. We cannot have these millions of people walking our streets in idleness. We cannot have our young men and women being demoralized in this way. For what is the position to-day? The first question that a young man or woman asks himself or herself is not how and where can I work? Their first idea is, how can I get on the dole, how can I get money for doing nothing? It is such a condition as this that is sapping and lowering the moral standards of our nation and taking away that spirit of independence which has built our nation, and we have now determined, with the help of our own working people, to put an end to that system and bring our markets against unfair labour sweated conditions. (Applause.)

THE OUTLOOK OF EMPIRE

AN ADDRESS BY SIR GRANVILLE RYRIE, K.C.M.G.

Tuesday, August 9, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

SIR GRANVILLE RYRIE: I must thank your worthy president for introducing me in such kindly terms. He has stated, of course, that I have been High Commissioner for Australia, in London, for the last five years. I am still High Commissioner, although I am absent from London, as my term does not expire actually until the tenth of September next. So I am still the High Commissioner for Australia.

Now, I feel that it is impossible for me to make a speech on "The Empire" without referring briefly to what is taking place at Ottawa, but I would not like to go into any details with regard to Ottawa at this time. To me it appears to be, as it were, *sub judice.* There are a lot of discussions going on, and some matters so far are only half-discussed, and it would not do for me to go into these discussions. However, I will refer to that again.

Now, I must be brief, because I have determined to take but half an hour of your time. I know you are busy men, but I must say a word with regard to our visit to Canada.

I have taken a great fancy to your country. Whether I will ever see it again or not is uncertain, but I have actually fallen in love with Canada. Canada is a very fine and very splendid country.

We left London on Saturday, and travelled in a very fine ship, the *Duchess of York,* and landed at Montreal, and saw all the sights on the way. We were greatly taken with the views of the country, and with the city of Montreal, but what attracted me most of all was your magnificent river, the St. Lawrence. It really dwarfs our rivers in Australia. I am sorry to say it, but it is so, although the Darling River in our country is navigable for some five hundred miles.

Your people have been so remarkably good to us, to my wife, my family and myself. We have met with every kindliness and consideration; every one seems to be out to help us see the sights of the country; every one seems to be out to please us in every possible way, and we are having a real, right royal time, which will be altogether too short, as we have to catch the *Niagara* at Vancouver. When I say *Niagara,* I am speaking of the ship.

Speaking of Niagara, yesterday through the good offices of your Premier (Hon. Mr. Henry) and his staff, we had a most excellent trip to the Falls of Niagara and back again. I have often heard of Niagara Falls, as compared with the falls in Southern Rhodesia—I think it is the south; either north or south; I am not quite sure—the Victoria Falls, and some people have told me that the Victoria Falls were more beautiful and more impressive than Niagara. I have now seen both, and I say without the slightest doubt that Niagara far and away surpasses the Victoria Falls in almost every way. The Victoria Falls are higher, and that is the only way in which they attain any superiority over Niagara. It is a magnificent sight. We saw the illumination last night, and were taken about to the vantage points by the staff of the Parks Commission in Niagara.

One thing which impressed us was a conversation we heard taking place between some Americans. I understand they are going to shift Goat Island half-way across the river (Laughter), so that they will get as much water as Canada. (Laughter.) They are a little bit "sore" at Canada having ninety five per cent of the water going over the Falls while they have only five per cent. So they have determined to shift Goat Island and put it out further in the river. You will have to look out for yourselves there.

I have been asked this morning why it is that although we only have six millions of population in Australia, as compared with Canada's ten millions, our two cities of Sydney and Melbourne are greater than the cities of Montreal and Toronto. In Sydney we have one and one-quarter millions of people, and in Melbourne, nearly a million nine-hundred-odd thousand. In the two cities combined there are over two millions of people—nearly two and one-quarter millions.

I cannot answer the question as to why that is so. The people flock into the cities; they congregate there. I think the people are seeking pleasures, and they do not think so much about undergoing the hardships of the bush, like the old campaigners did—the old explorers, the old pioneers. They will not go through the hardships; they want to be in the cities and go to the picture shows, especially the women and girls; they want to go to the picture shows—some of them every night. That is the only reason I can describe for it. It is not that we have not plenty of room in the country. There is plenty of good, arable land and good grazing land, if the people would do as their forefathers did, and scrape out a living for themselves. But they will not do that; they want the easy times of the life in the cities. That is just a little comparison between Australia, my country, and your country, Canada.

I think Canada, on the whole, is a more fertile land—at all events, from what we have seen of it. It is more suitable for agriculture. I noticed the beautiful vineyards and orchards on my way to Niagara, and I understand you make a lot of wine. I saw a number of wineries where you make your wines, and I was surprised, as you may be, to learn that there is a good market in Canada for the Australian wines. I am delighted to know that some of you prefer Australian wine to your own home brew. We have a number of fine manufacturers of wine, and we send annually over four millions of gallons of wine to London. I don't know whether you are aware of that, or not. We have an excellent market in London for our wine, which is really a port, although we cannot call it "port". I understand that Portugal is the only country where it may properly be called "port wine". There is a great sale of our wines in London. That is another difference between Australia and your great Dominion of Canada.

Now, I have been asked today to speak on "The Future of the Empire'.. Mr. President and gentlemen, that theme is so great and so extensive that it might be carried on to any extent you like. I might speak for hours upon it. but I know some one would probably draw a gun and shoot me if I attempted that. So I will say just a few words on "Empire".

There are some people today who say that the British Empire is becoming decadent, that the people are not so virile, that the days of the Empire are numbered. You will note I call it the "British Empire". I do not like the term "Commonwealth of Nations". (Applause.) I see that you call your Club "The Empire Club of Canada". It would not look well to call it "The Commonwealth of Nations' Club" (Laughter.) "British Empire" is good enough for me. (Applause.)

I say emphatically that there are ample signs that the British Empire is not decadent; the people are as virile as ever. True, there has been depression in the Empire, and in all parts of the Dominions, but we will get around the corner. In Australia we are already coming around the corner. (Applause.) The old Empire will carry on for many generations to come. (Applause.)

Now, why is it that this great Empire of ours is such a great empire? Why does the flag fly over the Dominions in all parts of the earth, over people of every colour, every race, every religion; all living under one flag? No other nation seems to be able to do that. Why is it that savage Zulus in South Africa, where once I was permitted to attend a big war dance, are so loyal to the British flag? They say it is because we have not despoiled them of their flocks and herds, and they are living at peace under the British flag.

Then there are the Basutos, that great body of mounted men. I had the privilege of attending one of their great meetings at which there were present twenty-five thousand mounted Basutos. There the Chief told me that the Basutos were loyal to the British Empire? Why? Because they had not been despoiled of their flocks and their herds, and I was told that if occasion arose where people were required to fight for King and country, the Basutos would immediately put fifty thousand mounted men in the field.

Why is this? Because of the flag. Because whereever that bit of bunting floats in the breezes it is the emblem of all that is right and just and of fair-play. That is why? The flag.

Unfortunately, we in Australia, and perhaps you in Canada, have a small minority of people who do not honour the flag, or who decry the flag. We have them in Australia. Thank God, they are mostly foreigners; very few were born in Australia, because we flatter ourselves that we are ninety-eight per cent British, and loyal to the Flag, to the King, and to the Empire. But, as I say, we have a small, noisy minority who decry the flag, and would trample it under their feet if they dared, but they do not dare. I presume you have something of the same sort here in Canada.

I firmly believe that the Empire is as solid as a rock. If it were not so, it would be a poor look-out for humanity and for the peace of the world.

Now, let us look back a few years. Perhaps I should not mention this, but your President referred to the time of the war. You remember at the time of the war Britain was thought to be very poorly armed, and poorly equipped for war. The Dominions were thought to be on the verge of breaking away from the Old Country. It was said, by the Germans especially, that Australia was ready to break away, and cut the painter at a moment's notice. Germany did not expect there would be any Australians in the war at all.

Well, what were the actual facts? You will pardon me for dwelling shortly with this, but briefly I will tell you of some of the things Australia did during those terrible times. At the opening of the war, when it was known by Australia that troops were wanted to go and fight for the old country and the flag, there was a great rush to join the colors. People from the bush and in the far-away corners of the country rode, some of them five hundred miles, to the nearest recruiting station. They came from all parts of Australia; expert axe-men, kangaroo-jumpers, timber cutters, people who had never seen the sea; they flocked by thousands into the recruiting stations. They knew that Britain wanted troops; they knew there was a quarrel on, but they did not know what the quarrel was about, and they cared not; if the King and country wanted soldiers, they were prepared to come and fight, and history will tell you how these Australian men fought, and how they died for the flag and for their country. (Applause.)

I had the honour of commanding a brigade from Sydney, and they were as fine a lot of fellows as ever shouldered rifles. In that brigade there were men of every social grade in life, men of every position, even mere boys, and they did such splendid service, and were so loyal to me, and displayed such courage and endurance, that I had the honour of being given some decorations at the hands of His Majesty the King. (Applause.) I give the credit for that to the boys who did the hardest part of the work, and who occupied the most dangerous positions.

I will not dwell longer on the war. Of course, we went to Gallipoli, and may I tell you one short story of an occurrence in Gallipoli—a true story. When we were at Gallipoli, the enemy made a forced attack on our lines; they came in droves, in hordes, by thousands. Our trenches were full of men, all Australians. The Turks advanced, crying, as was their wont, "Allah, Allah, Allah!"

A big Australian, standing over the parapet, loading his rifle, heard them coming, shouting their "Allah", and he yelled, "Yes, you can bloody well bring him along, too." (Laughter.) That was the spirit; they feared nobody. (Laughter.) It will not do for me to take up your time referring to these things. I would not have done so, had your president not mentioned it first.

I have tried to jot down a few notes this morning, of what I wanted to say this noon, but I had to see the pressmen and photographers, and all sorts of people, and I did not get very much time, and I have not much idea of what I am going to say to you, but it might be interesting for you to hear what Australia did in preparation for the war to help the Old Country at that time.

Australia sent four hundred thousand men over-seas. I do not know whether you were aware there were such a number. We know that Canada sent a large number over, but we had a longer distance to send them across. We clothed that four hundred thousand with wool of our own growth, manufactured in our own woollen factories. We armed them with rifles made in our own factory at Lithgow, N.S.W., and transported them in our own ships. We maintained them in the field at a cost of five hundred million pounds, upon which we have been paying interest to the old country. That is what Australia did as her share during the war. (Applause.) We left behind us in what we would call "foreign lands", sixty-six thousand of the flower of our population, which is a great loss. For a small country, with a population of six millions, to lose sixty-six thousand virile young men is very hard, in any country. However, the sacrifice was made in a common cause; it was made for King, for Empire and for Flag, and if the time were to come again—and we hope and pray it will not; we hope this Conference will result in doing away with war; we hope the Disarmament Conference, although it does not look very bright at the present time, will achieve something in the nature of ensuring peace—but if it should not, and we should be called again to defend the flag, or any part of the Empire, the men of Australia will do as they did before, flock to the colors by the thousands and be prepared to fight as they fought before, and be prepared to die for King, for Empire and for Flag. (Applause.)

Now for matters affecting the Empire since the war. That is a question upon which I hesitate to dwell at any length, as it is a political question. I, as High Commissioner, have always had to be pretty careful of what I say on politics, because I am not supposed to deal with controversial matters, and once or twice I "got the cane" for saying what I thought, because I am credited with generally speaking my mind. But my term is rapidly coming to a close, so I will take the chance of saying a few things. (Laughter.)

I will say this with regard to the good old Britisher. Wherever he is; he may be slow, and perhaps inclined to be stodgy, or lazy or something, or he may not take much interest or notice in what is happening, but when something arises vitally affecting the Empire he at once sits up and takes notice, and he will invariably adopt the right course. This happened with regard to the last general elections in England. The people came to realize that there was something vital at stake, and they rightly acted and turned out the wreckers who were in. They may not have been guilty of wrecking deliberately, but they were wrecking the country, there is no doubt about that. They were turned out neck and crop at the general elections in England, and a National Government put in its place, and it is the finest government England has ever had for many many a year. (Applause.) I want to give those men who came from the Labour Party, like MacDonald and Thomas and Snowden, and others, every credit in life, because they burned their bridges behind them; they took a chance in doing the right thing, in spite of the fact that they were forever cast out of their party, which they had nurtured from the time of its birth. They took the chance and threw it over and came over to the side they thought was right, and they have done magnificent work since.

I give MacDonald every credit. I was not always a great advocate of Ramsay MacDonald, because I remembered things in his early political days. But I went to Lausanne, and attended the Conference, and there I saw the magnificent work which MacDonald and the other Ministers did. Sir John Simon, Sir Samuel Howe, Churchill—they all did magnificent work at the Lausanne Conference, and it was well that they did, because had Lausanne failed, I think it would have been a great tragedy; there would have been chaos in the financial world—and it very nearly failed. On several occasions we thought it was "all up". We thought it had burst and there would be consternation and chaos in the financial world, and, as I have said publicly in London since, whatever MacDonald may have been in his youth or early political career. I forgive him all for the attitude he took at Lausanne. He played there a part which was invaluable in bringing matters to a satisfactory conclusion. He was sick, he was tired, he was weary, his eyes were bad, but he stuck to it night and day. They were up all night, some nights, until the dawn of the morning, battling with these people, getting them to come to some arrangement.

Of course, the great snags were Von Papen, on the one hand, and Herriot, on the other. They would become enraged with each other, and Von Papen would return to Berlin, and say, "It is finished", and Herriot would return to France, and say "That ends it", and then MacDonald would bring them together again, and they would come back, and he would lock them in a room for practically the whole night, and let them argue it out. It was a difficult problem to deal with. Von Papen knew if he went back to Berlin and let them know that he had agreed to give away too much, he would be chucked out of politics almost immediately. Herriot knew if he went back to Paris and told his political people there that he had not asked for enough, he would suffer the same fate, and so it was a mixture of politics and I don't know what else; at all events, politics was the ruling factor in the whole business. Of course, it should not have been, but you cannot get away from those things. You have politics mixed up with everything. (Laughter.) I repeat that I give MacDonald great credit for the part he played, and at the conclusion of the Conference, tired and weary though he was, he made the most eloquent speech I have ever listened to in my life, and I welcome this opportunity to pay a tribute to a man who was an old Labour man, but who has played such a splendid part in this new government. (Applause.)

In Australia, I was delighted to know that we followed suit. We had a party of wreckers in the Federal Parliament. We had Mr. Theodore, with his fiduciary—something—I cannot say it; I could say it early in the morning (Laughter)—fiduciary issue of notes. Well, I think that is merely a high-sounding term. They turn out the notes with a machine by simply turning the handle. That was his idea to save the country by this fiduciary issue. He was backed up by Scullen, who was the Labour Prime Minister. You know, I can say these things now because he is out neck and crop, the same as they turned the Labour Party out in England. We have identically the same government they have in London. I can say these things here, because I know you are a loyal part of the Empire, as loyal as are we in our sentiments in Australia. As I say, we have a government in Australia which coincides exactly with the Commonwealth government in London; that is, an old Labour man at the head of affairs. Mr. Lyons, who was the Premier of Tasmania; Mr. Fenton, who was a Labour Minister, and others, who came over and joined in a Nationalist Party composed of members of the three parties, which is identical with the joining of the three parties in London. We formed our Nationalist Government, and are getting along splendidly.

But there was another fly in the ointment, another snag. There was another man whom you have heard of, a man called Lang, in New South Wales. Lang was a political bush-ranger. I know that chap well, because I was in Parliament with him, and a worse bush-ranger never lived in politics—speaking politically. Finally, his turn came to go before the people, and there again the good old British spirit came to the top. They put their thinking caps on; they had been told enough lies before to do them for a generation, and had believed them, and had put Lang and his wreckers in power, and made a dreadful mess of everything in New South Wales, the Chief State in the Commonwealth. They came before the people and got the thrashing of their lives, and that was a great advantage. We have great hopes now that we are around the corner; that Australia will be booming again. I don't know whether she will ever boom quite so much as she did the last few years before the depression set in, but we hope there will be a steady trade.

But I must not keep on in this strain, because I want to say one word with regard to Ottawa. I do not know that I would be right in dwelling on matters which are under discussion, but as regards our man, Mr. Bruce—whom most of you probably know, at least by name—I consider him to be a very excellent delegate. (Applause.) I think he will be just to the Dominion of Australia. I noticed in the press that Bruce has asked too much. I know that Bruce has not gone to Ottawa in a bargaining sense; he does not seek bargaining; he wants to arrive at some decision beneficial to the old country, as well as to the Dominion, but at the same time, he, like you business men, is not asking for the minimum. (Laughter.) If you are selling a thing, you do not ask for the minimum at once. I know what it is, in trying to sell a mob of sheep. If a buyer comes along, and says, "What do you want", you will say, "Oh, I will take twelve 'bob' for them—cash". You say, "I would not take any less", and you say it clearly and distinctly, but at the same time you are prepared to take ten "bob" (laughter), until he finally comes down, and you end up by figuring, "Oh, well, we will split the difference" and you make it eleven 'bob', and you agree on that price.

I think that is what Bruce has done, and I do not think he is to be blamed too much for it. If he had stated the absolute minimum which satisfied Australia, he would have had no chance to come down. (Laughter.)

I do think that something practical will evolve from Ottawa. I think the atmosphere there is splendid. I think your Prime Minister, Mr. Bennett, will play a big part in bringing matters to a satisfactory issue. I think he is a very fine man indeed, and I compliment Canada upon having him as its Prime Minister.

I also compliment Canada upon its High Commissioner in London, my confrere, Mr. Ferguson—a very fine fellow, indeed. I am also very fond of Mrs. Ferguson, who is a very fine woman, and on the whole I think that Canada is being well served.

I do not think there is very much more I can say to you. I have rambled over my allotted half-hour. I did not mean to infringe on your time, and I close by saying that I thank you for listening to me for so long. I want to thank all the people in this fine city of Toronto for the great courtesy they have shown to my wife, my family and myself. They have done everything possible, providing us with cars, and running us about, and giving us every facility for seeing the sights of your beautiful city. I take it as a great compliment that you have done so, because I am a stranger to you. I thank your Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Henry) and his staff for their personal presence and making possible our view of your beautiful Niagara under such splendid conditions, and I say again that I believe that Canada and Australia will both play a great part in bringing this old Empire through these hard times.

The only fly in the ointment is the Emerald Isle. (Laughter.) It would be a bit dangerous for me to say too much about that. (Laughter.) At the same time, if I had anything to do with it, I would say, "Well, lads, you cannot have it both ways; you cannot be in the Empire for some things and out of it for others. (Hear, hear.) You cannot be in the Empire for trade considerations and outside the Empire for political and national reasons; you will have to take it or leave it; one way or the other; you are in or out." (Prolonged applause.) That is all I have to say about that question. (Laughter.) If I were to let my tongue run loose on Ireland, Lord knows what I might say. I am afraid I would have somebody treading on the tail of my coat.

However, Mr. President and gentlemen, I do thank you most sincerely for the very kind way in which you have listened to me. I don't know whether you would like to hear one story—

SEVERAL VOICES: Go on; go on.

SIR GRANVILLE RYRIE: This is a story they tell about the Melbourne Cup, one of the greatest races of the world. It seems that an old farmer from Victoria took his wife to Melbourne to see the Melbourne Cup run, and in the morning it was fairly chilly and the farmer dressed in a thick suit. When he and his old woman got in and sat down, the sun was shining, and it began to get a bit warm, so he took his coat off and hung it on the back of the seat. The old lady looked around, and gave him a lecture for taking off his coat in front of so many people. He said, "Well, I am too hot, and it will stay off". Shortly after, he took off his waistcoat, and the old lady gave him another lecture, and said "Why do you do that with all these people around?", and she said, "What will you be doing next?". Shortly after he took off his collar and tie. She said, "I am so ashamed of you, I don't know what to do; I am not going to look at you again", and she turned her back on him. Just then the Melbourne Cup started, and somebody sitting next to her, yelled "They're off"—and the old woman fainted. (Prolonged laughter.)

I thank you, Mr. President and gentlemen, from the bottom of my heart for this magnificent tribute you have paid to me.

A VOICE: Tell us another story. (Laughter.)

SIR GRANVILLE RYRIE: Well, I will tell you another of a different sort. There was a Duchess—rather a flighty Duchess—and a nervous professor, and they sat together at a big banquet. The professor upset the salt, and it being a Friday, and he being somewhat superstitious, he took a pinch of the salt and threw it over his left shoulder. Some of the salt went down the back of the Duchess (laughter), and she turned to him and said ,"No, no, Professor; you can't catch me that way." (Laughter.)

If you can stand one more short one—

SEVERAL VOICES: Go on, Sir Granville.

SIR GRANVILLE RYRIE: This will show you the adaptibility and knowledge and wit of our Australian boys in the bush. Some of them were playing cards, in my home town, and after they had played for a time, one of them got up and threw his cards face downward upon the table, and said, "That will do me; I am playing no more"; one of the other said, "What is the matter?", and he said, "What's the matter? the game is crooked; that's what's the matter". The other said, "Why, what do you mean", and he said, "Why, Bill never played the hand I dealt him." (Prolonged laughter.)

Bill got very drunk, and was taken to the hospital, and one of his friends said, "Poor old Bill, is in the hospital with D. T's; I went down to see him, and he is in a bad way; he has the "horrors". A little later, another said, "How is old Bill?", and the friend said, "He is stone blind; I said, 'How do you feel?', and he said, 'Not too good'. I said, 'Do you see any snakes around you?', and he said, 'No, I cannot see any', and there they were crawling all over his bed". (Laugher.)

I thank you, gentlemen, sincerely. (Prolonged applause.)

A vote of thanks was tendered the speaker by the president.

THE RACE FOR THE HARMSWORTH TROPHY

An Address by MR. KAYE DON.

Friday, September 9, 1932

Lieut.-Colonel George A. Drew, President, introduced the speaker.

Mr. Kaye Don: I want to thank you very sincerely for the very warm welcome which you extended to me. I will be very frank with you, and say that after things had gone so extraordinarily badly at Detroit, I was very diffident as to whether I should come to Toronto or not. In fact, I said to my friend, Captain Brown, that the boys at Toronto would not want to see me, that I had done nothing, and surely you would not wish to be bothered with me. Since I have been here, I realize what great sportsmen you all are, gentlemen. (Applause.) Whether I come to you flushed with success, or whether I come having done my best but failed, you receive me in exactly the same manner. It is indeed a very wonderful atmosphere to be in.

I think international contests such as the one I have just been competing in do a tremendous amount of good. I feel that I not only come to the Western hemisphere as the pilot of Lord Wakefield's boat, but also as an ambassador of sport, and I think that events such as these greatly help to cement the union which exists between Britain and her Dominions, which is also I believe one of the objects of your Club. I hope that visits like mine, and that of my friend Sir Malcolm Campbell, give you gentlemen an opportunity of knowing us a little better, and enables you to really better understand our points of view.

As to the Empire, we are sportsmen to the backbone. I know it was great sportsmen who rushed to the assistance of the Mother Country in the latter days of 1914, and the early days of 1915, and who not only helped to save our country, but also many other European countries. These sons of Canada who rushed to the war in the early days were ambassadors in the war, and proved their worth.

Visiting various parts of the world with *Miss England II* and *Miss England III* should give an opportunity for more complete understanding between people, and that is the objective I have always in mind, and one I hope I have been succssful in attaining in Canada.

With regard to the Harmsworth Trophy, I do not propose to make any excuses as to what happened, but to tell you simply what happened on Saturday and Monday.

My boat arrived in Detroit on the 19th of August, in the late evening, fifteen days before the first heat, and trials were made on August 22nd, August 24th, August 26th, and September 1st. The course was of such a nature—namely a three-mile straightaway, with one half mile turn at each end—that it did not require a tremendous amount of practice. The only point I was desirous of knowing was that my boat would function properly, and to get a knowledge of the course, and to practice my starts as well as I could, for that is really a very important thing in the races. Then, if the opportunity presented itself, I was desirous of trying the boat in really rough water, which I had not been able to do before, and I wanted to know how it would perform.

My last test was made on Thursday, and my boat was back in the boat-well for final inspection; all parts were tested which would be likely to vibrate. This gave my mechanics Thursday and Friday for their work, which was ample time.

Saturday's race is history. Both Gar Wood and myself got away to a fairly good start. I think I am correct in saying that I was leading at the line by approximately four seconds. For three laps I steadily increased my lead, and at the end of the third lap was ahead something in the region of fifty seconds. By the end of the fourth lap, trouble had developed which had reduced by lead to three seconds. During the fifth lap one of my motors stopped entirely, which meant I had to lose my lead, and finish the lap at a very, very slow speed—at about 50 miles an hour.

After the boat was returned to the boat-well, it was found upon examination that the throttle control had become disconnected. When I say "throttle control" I want you to understand exactly what that is; it is a small rod about twelve inches long, and it connects to the carburettor with a ball joint. The screw of this had vibrated loose, and allowed the rod to jump out of the socket, thus closing the throttle of my starboard engine.

It was also found on examination that owing to the weaving of the boat in Saturday's race, the overflow pipe from my motors had been pulled inboard, and the water which circulates through the motors, instead of going overboard, came inboard. I will tell you that that pipe is one and one-quarter inches in diameter, and the pressure of water is about nine pounds, so I am sure you will realize, gentlemen, the amount of water we took in. My boatmen told me that as a matter of fact it was approximately two tons. At the end of the race the boat was low in the water, and I had very great fears that she might sink entirely.

That was the result of Saturday's race, and I must say that conditions were not altogether ideal for high-speed boats. The water was rough, and the average speed was low. I think I put up the fastest speed, which was my first lap, at about 88½ miles per hour, which is fast time for that course.

The boat was back in the boat-well about eight o'clock. My men immediately got to work for a general inspection and overhauling. It was found that owing to the tremendous pounding the boat had received quite a few things had become loosened; they were all tightened up, and my boys worked all day Saturday, Saturday night and on until about one a.m. on Sunday morning.

Monday's race started under ideal conditions. Both boats got away to a very good start indeed. *Miss England III* was leading the American over the line by about two boats lengths. I am told this was quite the best start they had ever seen in the Harmsworth Trophy Race.

I had not gone very far, unfortunately, perhaps a mile, when my starboard engine stopped, and I told my mechanic, Mr. Garner, to go to the back of the boat and see if anything could be done, but events proved he could not do anything at all, and I had to go around the course to the best of my ability. We must finish if we can. I went around with one motor, and after one and one-half laps it stopped. That was due to the terrific load I put on the motor and the excessive work it had to do. It overheated, and many of you gentlemen here will know what that means to an engine. We developed a certain amount of piston trouble, and did a whole lot of other damage, as a matter of fact.

It was afterwards discovered that my first trouble was again due to the throttle control, which on this occasion had broken, and upon examining the port engine, as I told you just now, we found it was badly overheated, and the pistons smashed, and the connecting rod came off, and soforth.

Well, gentlemen, that is the complete story of the Harmsworth race. Needless to say I am very, very disappointed, but not downhearted. (Applause.) I am still of the opinion that the Rolls Royce engines are the very finest in the world; there is no doubt in my mind about that, and I have had a tremendous amount of experience with them.

Small things happened which put me out of both heats, a thing which I have never experienced before in all of my racing career, and which in all probability will never happen again.

The hull finished in excellent condition, and I want you to believe this when I tell you that I think it is one of the finest hulls that America has ever seen. Great credit is due to the boat builder. It was made by that famous builder, Thornycroft, and also the Rolls Royce. One must not lose sight of the fact that the boat, even though the engines failed at Detroit, is still the fastest boat in the world. She is the holder of the world's water speed record, and is the first boat to travel over two miles a minute. (Applause.)

She proved by the first three laps in the first race on Saturday that she was a very, very worthy challenger, and I sincerely trust Lord Wakefield, that great British sportsman, who so generously and whole-heartedly backed this venture, will see fit to recondition the boat, and make another attempt, and I hope I shall be the pilot.

(Applause.)

I thought, gentlemen, you might like to hear the history of *England III.* I hope I am not keeping you too long, but I will be as brief as I can.

It was first decided to build *Miss England III* in January, and, after very careful consideration, the order was placed by Lord Wakefield with Thornycroft. The boat was built in their yard at Hampton-on-Thames, near London, and she was installed with the latest type of Rolls Royce engines, capable of producing in the neighbourhood of thirty-two hundred revolutions. Such things as the shaft, the rudder structure, and the rudder gear were made by another firm whom you all know, Vickers, of 110 tensile steel, and I am sure you will agree with me if you saw them, that they are masterpieces of engineering.

The power is taken from the engines by a shaft forward to the gear box, and by a propeller shaft to the propellers. The propellers, of which I have two, are seventeen inches in diameter, with a twenty-inch pitch, and they turn at approximately seven thousand revolutions per minute.

England III was completed in May, and I took her to Lake Goddard in Italy for her first trial. The reason we go there is that the weather is very good, and nine days out of ten you can put a boat in the water and continue your work without any interruption from bad weather. There it was found that although the boat was very good at speeds up to 100 miles an hour, over that she had a tendency to be somewhat nose-heavy, and the very best speed I did there was 106 miles an hour.

The boat was then brought back to England, and certain modifications were made, and then we went to Loch Lomond in Scotland. It was found on my first trial there that we had over-corrected the fault we had found in Italy, and instead of planing, she listed, which meant further modifications had to be made, and this was done at Loch Lomond.

During the trials I found I had acquired a perfect plane angle, but our troubles were not at an end. We found at speeds over 100 miles an hour that owing to something peculiar happening to the stern of the boat we could not get any water to the engines. We had her water scoops fitted at the stern, but we could not get any water, with the result that the motors were starved and overheated.

After experimenting, it was found necessary to take these scoops away, and put them under the forward step. That was done, and a further trial was made on the morning of July 18th. I took the boat out about 7.30 in the morning, and it was officially timed over the mile, and she did a speed—I think I am correct in saying—of 117 plus miles per hour one way, and 118 miles per hour the other way, which gave us a world's record of 117 plus miles per hour average.

I then took it back to the boat-well, and I used some special fuel, which gives increased horse power. That was put in, and the boat was taken out again, and this time it resulted in a speed, going form north to south, of 120.5 miles per hour, and on the return journey she did 119.121 miles per hour, giving me a mean speed of 119.81 miles per hour. That was the first time a boat had ever travelled at more than two miles a minute. (Applause.)

Miss England III was then sent back to Derby to be prepared for the Harmsworth Trophy. The Rolls Royce engines were taken out, stripped, carefully examined, reassembled, put on test, and put back in the boat. Every nut and bolt was tested, and the gear box taken out, and the whole thing reassembled, and when we arrived at Detroit I thought I had a 100 per cent. perfect job. I still think that. It was a wonderful job; it was prepared to the very very best of our ability. The boat now has left Montreal and is on its way back to England.

With regard to the future, I am of the opinion that speeds will get higher; in fact, as I am talking to you now, my great American competitor, Commodore Gar Wood, is busy preparing his boat for an attack on our record. Personally I think he will get it. I had the opportunity of seeing his boat, and he has really done a good job. He has four motors in it, giving him something over 6,400 horse power, and I should not be surprised any moment to see him get the world's record. But I think I can safely say this, that we shall have a most effective reply. (Applause.)

I think it is possible on my return to England that further modifications can be made to *Miss England III,* and she will be able to show she is capable of attaining even greater speeds than she has already attained. In the event of our losing our record, I am confident that Lord Wakefield will put the boat in condition again and endeavour to regain that which we have lost.

Mr. President, I thank you for the great hospitality you have extended to me, and if I come over again I hope I shall have the opportunity of seeing you once more. (Prolonged applause.)

BEHIND THE SCENES

AN ADDRESS BY MR. ARTHUR BEVERLEY BAXTER, EDITOR OF THE LONDON DAILY EXPRESS

Thursday, September, 22, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

MR. BAXTER:—Before I start on the story of what has gone on in the Old Country more or less behind the scenes—at any rate certainly behind closed doors—I would first like to tell you that it is not without a very real emotion that I come back home to find—I am not going to use the trite expression "among my own friends" —but I am certainly glad to be here and to see my old friend Mr. James Hughes, with whom I went to Phoebe Street Public School before I developed into the higher roads of Lansdowne School. (Laughter.) I am certainly pleased to be among friends knowing that they are also friends of my father and mother. It makes me look forward to the return journey with a certain degree of sadness, because the trip back to the Old Country, to the great metropolis, is always something of a thrill. To those who are my friends here I say again, "How do you do" and "I am so glad to see you." Why you turn up so regularly every year is one of the mysteries of the universe and one that I won't attempt to solve to-day.

It was the year 1928 when I was here last. You may not remember that year very well. There was considerable excitement about International Nickel at the time, and all my friends who were millionaires treated me very generously. I never spent a penny. It is quite different this visit I assure you. Life was very pleasant here.

I said to two or three of my friends who had just made about a million that aftenoon: "It seems to me that the present stock valuation of International Nickel is now about four times greater than it should be, and we'll have to write off four billion dollars to earn five per cent." One of my friends said, "You don't understand figures," and I said that was true. I have been quite honest with my friends to-day because I reminded them of what I had told them.

Now, to my subject. We had at that time a Conservative government under the leadership of Stanley Baldwin. It had a large majority, and things were going badly in England; but things going badly in England are not so bad as in other countries. The Englishman has a strange sense of the centuries. He will say, "It looks as if we are in for a bad period of fifty or sixty years, but that doesn't matter in a country that has lasted so long as we have." It is quite a simple phenomenon.

Things, as I said, were going badly and Mr. Baldwin, who had a large majority, was finding things difficult and his government was slowing up. All governments are born to die. From the moment they are elected they are born to die, and this government was in the death throes. I remember my friend Colonel Moore-Brabason somewhat astonishing parliament by turning to his own front bench and saying: "The snores of this government are reverberating throughout the country." Brabason was the first man in England to fly, and nobody ever came down so fast politically as he did on that speech. I would say that in politics as well as in domestic life, it is well to ignore the snores sometimes. However, the government went on to its death and an election was on the country in 1929.

I must explain to you at this stage the position that Mr. Baldwin occupies in English public life. He is greatly liked and greatly respected. There is no man who loves his country with a greater patriotism than Stanley Baldwin. In the war he did a fine thing indeed. When his shares enhanced in value he very unselfishly gave to the nation, I think £150,000. That was not known for a long time. And yet I have spent most of my journalistic life trying to destroy Baldwin politically, and it shows the enormous power of the press when I say that his life is no more destroyed now than ever it was, or no more destroyed than when I first started. Nevertheless, in the opinion of Lord Beaverbrook, and myself, Baldwin was regarded as a danger to the empire. We regarded Baldwin's government as a danger because in 1929 we advocated going to the country on the question of taxing foreign foodstuffs; because we were firmly convinced that without it you can never do anything for imperial development and that without imperial development this country must go down and down until it reaches the position of a secondary power. Whether we are right or not, that was our opinion.

Mr. Baldwin stood up in the Coliseum Theatre and said that never so long as he was Conservative leader would he submit to a tax on foodstuffs. It was on this question that we differed with Baldwin. Lord Beaverbrook is a difficult man, impetuous and hard hitting, but of his love for the Empire and Canada no words which I may utter can adequately describe. Baldwin would not go to the country on this question, and so the papers more or less abused him. His government was swept out of office and in came Ramsay MacDonald and the Socialists. From then on, British politics took on sheer melodrama. Things went from bad to worse. The Socialist government tried every expedient, but they were not strong men. They had Ramsay MacDonald, a man of great character, a visionary, and they had Snowden, the living reincarnation of Robespierre—sea-green, incorruptible, charming and cruel. So this government went on and the unemployed figures rose like a tragic tide, and everything went on until the summer of last year. Mr. Baldwin had gone to take a cure. I don't know why he had gone. Mr. MacDonald had gone to Lossiemouth, and Lord Beaverbrook had gone to Canada, from which no traveller willingly returns. (Laughter.) There was a calm before the storm. Everybody was saying the situation is terrible, the financial situation is so bad that an adverse trade balance is growing. Something must be done, and Ramsay MacDonald appointed his seventy-eighth commission. He had appointed seventy-seven to look into the drink trade and other questions. Then he sent for Sir George May, the chairman of the Prudential Insurance Company, asking him to appoint a committee of three to look into the nation's financial state and report to parliament. And they too went on their holidays and I was the only one left in London. (Laughter.)

Sir George May did a very unkind thing. Instead of taking two years, as every other commissioner did, he turned his report in in three days, and what is more he gave it to the press and out it came like a bombshell, a most drastic report, nothing short of saying that this country has only a month to go before it is bankrupt. You must not think that I was playing golf with Sir George May, because his handicap is too big in the first place. (Laughter.) In England they have a very funny habit. The first name of a person seems to have a great attraction for the people. They speak of Winston and they speak of Ramsay and even the taxi-drivers never call Mr. Baldwin Baldwin, but Stanley. Baldwin is never spoken of as Baldwin. If I appear to be unduly familiar with the names of these eminent men you will forgive me, I hope. At any rate Ramsay MacDonald came down from Lossiemouth to Downing Street and he called a meeting of the political editors. Well, I put on a stiff collar and did my best to look like one. It was extraordinarily interesting. MacDonald was rattled; he was very much excited, and if he had had his way I think he would have had Sir George May executed. He said, "This is terrible. I think I must have an international conference", and somebody with a rather low mind suggested it was not an international affair, that a national conference might be better. However, they suggested to come together and at that stage Ramsay MacDonald looked to me like a weak man rattled by big events, and I went away with a good deal of discouragement as to what was going to happen. I realized, as editor of the *Daily Express,* my own responsibility, because at these times of national crisis the press in England plays a big part in public life. Public opinion looks enormously to the newspapers for guidance, and it was not difficult to see that a crisis of real magnitude was approaching. There were goings and comings in Downing Street and much excitement. I tell you this not to glorify myself in any way, but to glorify for a moment the profession in which I am engaged and which so many of my friends are. I went to lunch in the city that day and I met two or three of the bankers there, and I said, "Is there nothing which can stop this run on sterling? Is there nothing which can steady the situation", and one of them said, "If you put an immediate ten per cent. tariff on imports that will create confidence for the moment." I would have liked to have talked it over with Beaverbrook but he was away in Canada, so I went back to my paper and I put on the front in type which would have made the *Telegram* jealous (Laughter)—"Bankers, Manufacturers, Farmers and Workers demand a ten per cent. revenue tariff." I was told afterwards by Doctor Alexander, one of the Socialist ministers, that the Cabinet sat all day with the *Daily Express* before them. (Laughter.) They realized the tactical advantage of the situation; if the Socialists brought in tariffs it would automatically bring with them the support of the Conservative members. They were in a marvellous good tactical position. They could have imposed tariffs and we would have to support them. If the tariffs failed they could say, "Well, we were forced to it. It wasn't our policy." All but three members were in favour of adopting the policy, but that little Robespierre, who could hardly walk from one room to another—so great is this little beggar's brain and so terriffc his personal power and force—conquered the rest of them and they went to their doom.

I will leave it to the newspaper men to supply a fitting simile. The Socialist Government suddenly collapsed and

Ramsay MacDonald became the head of the first national government. I think myself it was a splendid thing of Baldwin to rally to the support of Ramsay MacDonald. There are critics who say that he should have held out and continued with a Conservative government, but I think Baldwin did an honourable and unselfish thing. The First National Government was formed with the financial situation still terrible, with the country going downhill. Then came the election, one of the most astonishing elections ever held in history. The National Government had to go to the country because it was a wobbly organization. They went to the country, but before they went they said to the army, "We are going to cut your pay by 12%;" they said to the navy, "We are going to cut your pay;" to the civil service, to the unemployed, right through they said: "Here you are, there is our policy, cut pay". A few of the experts said, "This is suicide, but they went to the country and Great Britain rallied as only that very marvellous little country can do. (Applause.) The unemployed man, being paid barely enough for the barest of necessities, voted for the country just as much as any duke or any bank manager would. It was one of the most marvellous things I have seen in my life. Once again there was unanimity amongst the political leaders. There was unanimity amongst the press, and England more than any other country, or at least its population, voted like one man and the reason for this is that England more than any other country has this great love of country. There is a love of country which puts its interests before their own. Some day those of us who are Canadians must study that aspect of English life a little more closely.

I think I have got my facts in the wrong order. I want to tell you about the going of the gold standard. That was an astonishing performance. As you remember, the raids on sterling were getting heavier and heavier. The Government had decided to try to remain on the gold standard as long as humanly possible. The Government was borrowing in Paris and New York to keep the pound where it was. The financial situation was very bad indeed. Oh yes, this did precede the election. At that time, Lord Beaverbrook came back and he said, "I think this country is making a great mistake in trying to stay on the gold standard. Do you think it would be wise to advocate in the press the abandonment of the gold standard?" I told him that it was beyond my comprehension, that I did not think it should be done as the result of press agitation. We talked about it but dropped the idea. One Sunday morning, about eight o'clock, Lord Beaverbrook called me and said, "Well, it is come." I said, "What has come." He said, "The crash." Well, I did not know what to say to that, but ultimately I said, "The financial crash has come?" and he said, "Yes." He said, "This is the most serious situation that the country has faced in many, many years. He said, "Where are you going to be?" Sunday is a holiday for me until five o'clock and so I told him I thought I would go out and play golf. He said, "I will get you there if I want you." So I went out and played golf, and such is human frivolity that a slice that had been bothering me all the summer suddenly disappeared. I was sorry to notice the fact, but some of you who have lost your slice may know the reason why.

After we had played two or three holes there were messages from Lord Beaverbrook, and I went down to see him at his town house. There were people there and he called me into the dining room. His first words were, "For the first time in hundreds of years this mighty country cannot meet its commitments." And he broke down and cried like a kid. It was an extraordinary sight, I can tell you, and I never wish to see such a sight again. Human life is apt to be so inartistic. Then at this stage there came a telephone message from New York to Beaverbrook, and he went to the phone. It was some group of financiers who had glimmerings of what was going to happen and they wanted Lord Beaverbrook's advice. Beaverbrook, roaring like a bull, said, "You want my advice, you miserable scoundrels, you and the swine of the Bank of France have brought these things about, and I'll see your souls in Hell before I give you any advice." He yelled this so loudly, and then he came in and said, "Do you think perhaps I was a little rough with them?" I said "No, but why did you bother using the telephone? I think they would have heard you without it."

Just at that time I got a message that the Prime Minister wanted to see the editor of the *Daily Express* at six o'clock. I suspected it was for a conference of editors. While Lord Beaverbrook knew what was happening, only four or five men on the inside knew that the country had gone off the gold standard. The public did not know; the press did not know. I went down to the only conference of editors that I ever had attended. Mostly we stay apart, and when we all got together I thought it was a good idea that we stayed apart. When we got there we were taken into the cabinet room with Mr. MacDonald the Prime Minister, Mr. Baldwin, Sir Herbert Samuel and my old friend Robespierre, who was in the new government of course. He was Chancellor of the Exchequer. I had not seen Ramsay MacDonald since the short time previously when I described him as being rattled with events. The change in the man was astonishing. Whatever he might have been in the past he had suddenly become a very big man. There was simplicity and grandeur written all over him. He said—I don't know how he keeps his Scottish accent so pure—he said in that beautiful rolling voice, "Gentlemen, just allow me to tell you the events of the last few days and the decision which the government has come to." He said, "Most reluctantly, we have borrowed and borrowed hoping that these foreign raids on our currency would stop. Finally the situation became so desperate that we agreed that we would stay on the gold standard to eleven o'clock, but at eleven o'clock the Bank of England was forced to abandon the gold standard." Not having then the governments acquiescence, that left the Bank of England legally liable. He said, "To-morrow, in the House of Commons, I shall introduce an indemnity bill. It will pass through the House of Commons in all stages by five o'clock; by six o'clock it will go to the House of Lords, by a quarter past six it will have received their assent. By seven o'clock it will receive the Royal assent and then it will become law."

When you think of Ramsay MacDonald in 1918, when English sailors would not carry him on their ships; when you think of him hunted and labelled pacifist, traitor, and now for the moment the saviour of England, I sometimes think that real life surpasses anything that the theatre can do. Then said the Prime Minister, "To-morrow the government of the country passes from us to you. According to how you represent it will the fate of the country be decided. It will either be bankrupt and chaos will ensue, or, if well represented, there will be renewed confidence and the country will be saved." It was shrewd of him. He gave us time to act together. As I am telling you what goes on behind the scenes, that was magnificent. But then came the unconscious bit of comic opera into this serious condition. MacDonald said, "I want to keep this a secret, gentlemen, until midnight. I ask you to pledge your word that you will not give it out." I said, "I am perfectly certain that no man will speak. but such are the strange ramifications of the press that within fifteen minues every foreign correspondent in London will have sent out messags to their papers." I told him that that would happen. I cannot deny my own profession. The Prime Minister disagreed with me, so I have had the distinction of being disagreed with by the Prime Minister. We said we had better stop the radio from sending it out, and all the stations were notified accordingly, as also was the press. It was all arranged that we would not go to the press with the story until midnight, and we left Downing Street. A London crowd has that strange psychic quality so difficult to explain, and to our astonishment when we got outside we found about 10,000 people waiting, and the remarkable thing was that my own cook was amongst the crowd and I was pleased that she recognized me. I went down to my office, and true to my word to the Prime Minister, I said to the staff, "I want to take for myself the front pape of the paper. I am writing a story and it does not matter what murders you have got I am going to take the front page." I sat down and started to write and at ten minutes to twelve by the clock, I got a telegram from Berlin and one from New York saying "Do you want a story on reaction to Britain's abandonment of the gold standard?" That was the touch of comic opera. The Prime Minister said that the news would not leak out, but it did leak out. We came out with our publication next morning and said to the English public, "Yesterday the pound was backed by gold in the vaults of England; to-day it is backed by the character of the British people, and the resources of the British nation." (Applause.) We said, 'Now this is the beginning of better things and better times." We all said the same thing. The Englishman read his paper and he backed the loser of the 2.30. (Laughter.) Everybody felt splendid. If MacDonald had not done anything but this, it would have shown him to be a big and shrewd man.

But, gentlemen, I did not literally plan this speech at all. This is a running story of what has been going on for the past year or two, and one could go on for hours. (Voice—"Go ahead.") Well, I shall bring the events just up to date. Now, what is the situation to-day as far as the government is concerned? I believe that Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's star is now waning. That is not his fault; it is because he has no party; he has no following in politics, and so I think that presently you may see the Prime Minister retiring from active politics. Owing to the strange Scottish irony of the man, and knowing him as I do, I would not be surprised if he went to the House of Lords just to complete the most perfect story that has been written for centuries. But if he goes it will be with his tongue in both cheeks. Robespierre is there already, to complete the circle. Mr. Baldwin will not go to the House of Lords, although I would not be greatly surprised to see his retirement fairly soon, but not for the years of work I have done to try and persuade him to go. He is a poor man. His shares have suffered very heavily. I don't think his income is large enough to enable him to occupy a house in Rosedale. I think he will probably retire, and I think you will see a very strong Conservative government, probably under Mr. Neville Chamberlain. After all, Mr. Chamberlain belongs to one of the ruling families, in the political sense, and he will give us a greater impetus to imperial development than any other Prime Minister would. Naturally, when the empire conference took place we all expected great things from it. We had been working under the leadership of Beaverbrook for years. We did everything in our power to further the cause of imperial development and we don't ask for gratitude; we were only doing what we considered our duty. If it were possible for us to have had our way, I would have said, "Go to Ottawa in the spirit of 1914." When England asked Canada to send men she asked if Canada could send 15,000 men. Canada sent, I think, 400,000 men and spent $600,000,000 or more. That figure, however, I am not quite sure of. So did Australia and New Zealand. I think England should have gone to this conference and said, "We don't bargain. Here are our markets. We must give your manufacturers and your farmers what preference we can. She should not have said, "We must have the first bite off the cherry"; she should have said, "We get your wheat and from Australia we get the best of meat. We cannot get better wheat or better meat, and we ask nothing in return." That should have been the spirit, I think, with which we should have entered this conference. I don't think that would have been bad business. Knowing the Canadian as I do, that would have left the responsibility to the Canadians, and eventually they would have found a way of responding. That is what made us a little bit sick in England. To the credit of the English delegates, and also to the credit of Bennett and the rest, it must be said that they survived the bargaining, and I think the outcome of that conference will prove the beginning of better things, of big things. I do sincerely hope so with all my heart.

Just to finish with, when you come back to a country after some years absence, one does see things vividly for the first few days. After that, old associations are renewed and one gets different impressions. When I landed in Canada I found that there was just a little more discouragement in the air than is justified by facts. I am a bull about Canada. I think you are going to see within the next two or three years an advance such as few countries have ever seen. I think you are going to be fortunate almost above all nations, but I hope when your prosperity comes again it won't be the prosperity of the stock market. That prosperity always has to burst, and with the burst comes the deluge. I want to see, as one whose life is devoted to my country here, I want to see the prosperity of smoking chimneys, busy farms, stocks which are based on earnings. If you are going to run a casino run a casino. Be honest enough; don't run a stock exchange instead of a casino. The only difference between the two is that with a stock exchange it takes a little while longer to lose your money but it is more certain.

When I was here about four years ago I said that England was a tired country. I thought it was tired. It looked tired to me, but the resources of that nation are beyond description. The people are gluttons for punishment. Nothing can get them down. Only persuade an Englishman that things are bad, and he is all right. (Laughter.) When it came to this conversion loan a few weeks ago the government announced that they were going to offer two billions of war loan at 3½%. Just imagine what that meant to the little men, the man with £500 a year, just able to belong to a little cheap golf club, just able to send a son to a little better school. And suddenly he is asked to reduce his income by £85 to £90 a year. It just means no golf club, a cheaper school, no theatre and no occasional holiday. When the government brought this out, a few of us wondered how much would be left in the government's hands and some of the sharpest men in England estimated at least 50% would be left, and that the government would be left with one billion converted and one billion unconverted. But what happened? All of the hundred million were converted voluntarily and as far as I see nothing went wrong. The spirit of the country was wonderful, and I say this, that if the government had gone to the country and said, "You are going to get 1% instead of 3½%" they would have got it, because the people have a most marvellous sense of the welfare of their country. You have got your own civilization here, your own ways of thinking, but I ask you to keep always a kindly spot in your hearts and minds for that much troubled, sometimes very stupid, but very lovable little country across the ocean. It does not matter what the surface civilization may be in Canada; it is from this great country overseas that you got the source of your civilization. There in the little winding lanes which lead around to the Red Lion and the Crown and Anchor; there in the little villages scattered all over, and there along the muddy banks of the Thames lie the germs of our civilization here. It is there that you find a country with a people stubborn, slow to adopt new methods, a little inclined to think that they live on the mainland instead of an island, but there is a country to whom honesty is one of the first lessons in life and one of the last ever to be forgotten. When the government decided that they would have a tariff they said it must be removed from politics, and that they would appoint three men to decide whether certain industries should be taxed or not, and, when they decided, they would bring in legislation to implement it in parliament. When they decided on that step they had no trouble whatever to locate three incorruptible men. They could have located 3,000 incorruptible men in five minutes in England. "You may rob each other, but you don't rob the nation. You will forgive me now for this speech. I may have gone backwards and sideways, but I hope I have not exhausted you, and I do sincerely hope that I have given you, for better or for worse, the story of what has gone on politically in the last four years. Thank you. (Loud applause.)

THE NEW EMPIRE PARTNERSHIP

AN ADDRESS BY SIR PERCY HURD, M.P.

Thursday, September 29, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

SIR PERCY HURD: It is quite true that as a boy I was in the service of the Canadian Pacific Railway in London, which at that time was a very small beginning compared to the huge organization which exists to-day. It is also true about that time as a lad I had an intimate association as a junior with one of your great newspapers *The Toronto Globe,* of which the well-known novelist, James Rice, was a member. He was the London correspondent and I was one of his minnows. My association with Canada and Toronto has been a somewhat lengthy one and always a most happy one, and that association of happiness to-day is increased by your kindness in making me your guest. I greatly appreciate your presence and your kind invitation.

The Chairman has told me that you have been good enough to think that I may be able to say something of interest to Canadians about the British attitude towards the Imperial Economic Conference which has just been held at Ottawa. What does it mean to the average Englishman and what does he expect from it? In view of the latest news from London and the resignation of certain Ministers, what are the prospects of this new policy of Empire partnership to which the Governments of the Empire are committed?

I am speaking to you at a moment when the political atmosphere in England is somewhat agitated. You may not be surprised to hear that political atmospheres go that way at times in all countries. I am a Conservative supporter of the National Government under Mr. Ramsay MacDonald; but I am in Canada and it is a wise rule to keep one's party politics for home consumption. I propose to do that to-day, and will try and put before you my version of the facts of the present position in a frank but non-partisan spirit.

First, as to the meaning of the Conference, as the average Englishman sees it. Here in Toronto, no less an authority than Lord Hailsham, a British Minister attending the Conference and a man of great weight in British affairs, has told you that he is profoundly satisfied with the achievements of the Conference. No calmer, better reasoned or more statesmanlike utterance on Empire affairs has been delivered in our day than his speech here a week or two ago. Mr. Neville Chamberlain, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, upon whom, with Lord Hailsham, fell the chief burden of the Conference negotiations, has, since his return to England, borne similar testimony to the success of the Conference, and so has Mr. Baldwin, the leader of the British House of Commons. Of course, you have heard, as I have done at Ottawa, Montreal, and elsewhere, stories of dramatic moments at the Conference, conflicting currents, frayed tempers and strong language. I have seen enough of parliamentary life in Westminster to be undisturbed by these stories. We are all human beings at the best. The achievements of the Conference stand and will stand. It would be foolish and contrary to nature to suppose that in pursuing this new and, in some respects, untried Empire path, it will all be easy going. The Empire interests are many and varied, and there will be awkward corners and possible collisions. But the confidence of those who made the agreements is unhesitating, and the first point I wish to emphasize is that this confidence is the confidence also of the great body of the British people. When the British Parliament reassembles in a fortnight's time, there will be an overwhelming vote in support of what the National Government has done. But you may say—"What about dissentient voices in the press and in Parliament?" Of course there are dissentient voices. Did you ever know of any great cause in free countries that evoked all ayes and never a no? Had Cobden and Bright and Peel no political critics? Yet their Free Trade ideas ruled England for three generations, until indeed those ideas had lost all relevance to the controlling economic forces of our day. British war policy in 1914 had bitter opponents. Yet it swept Britain along with resistless force until victory was won. There were Ministerial resignations then—John Morley, John Burns and others. Their places were filled and the cause passed on to triumph. Why? Because the vast majority of the British people would have it so.

Look for a moment beneath the flurries on the surface of British political life. Less than a year ago the British people were called upon to declare their will on an issue as momentous as any that has come up for popular decision in this generation. Britain had to be saved from the bankruptcy and disgrace to which it was rapidly drifting; the engines had to be quickly reversed to escape the precipice. Only by a supreme national effort could disaster be avoided. The gravity of the position was disclosed by men who were no politicians, men of the highest national standing. The economic fabric of the nation and the Empire had to be rebuilt upon sure and lasting foundations, and one of the essential means to that end was declared upon every political platform to be the creation of a closer economic union between the States of the Empire. Ottawa became a household word all through the United Kingdom. By helping each other, the free and independent British democracies scattered over the face of the globe were to help themselves. The British Commonwealth of Nations was to become the British Commonwealth of Trading Partners—home and Empire first and then, and only then, the friendly foreigner. The newly-formed National Government of Conservatives, Liberals and Labour, asked the electorate for an aboslutely free hand. It sought liberty to take whatever means, tariff or otherwise, it found necessary to solve our economic difficulties, however much those means might run counter to old accepted theories and practices. That was the National policy of the National Government and of all its Ministers. That was their united appeal to the electorate. What was the result? The electoral majorities up and down the country for the National Government and their declared policy were embarrassing in their hugeness. Conservatives, Liberals and Labour candidates, fighting what were held to be impossible seats, were surprised to find themselves members of parliament. The national cause was the only cause worth talking about. The vote was decisive and national, beyond any recent precedent. That was just eleven months ago. Has the British temperament, slowly developed over the centuries, suddenly become so fickle that it now turns round and rends the National Government for doing what it was told to do? That is hardly the British way. The Ottawa agreements will, I say, pass through the British Parliament by overwhelming majorities. Out of the twenty Cabinet Ministers, two in the House of Commons, and two only, will ease their Free Trade consciences by speech and vote against the Government. That is nothing new; they have done so several times before. They have spoken and voted against the Government of which they have been members. That curious affair, in spirit unconstitutional and un-British, 'the agreement to differ' has been in operation. It now comes to an end. The National Government, with its Conservative, Liberal, and Labour members, will be solid for the policy which the Ottawa Conference represents. Liberal speeches against the National Government have been in the past and will be again balanced by other Liberal speeches for. The National Government goes on with its appointed national task. Without intending any disrespect, we may use the old Eastern phrase, "The dogs bark and the caravan moves on".

The third retiring Cabinet Minister, Lord Snowden, is in the House of Lords, and speech and vote there on such an issue as this are of little more than academic interest. The two dissentient Liberal Cabinet Ministers, Sir Herbert Samuel and Sir Archibald Sinclair, have been especially featured in the press. They are estimable public men, but let us get things into something like the true perspective. They have been enjoying the halo of office which descended so unexpectedly upon their heads, a year ago. They seemed destined to spend the rest of their political lives in the cold shades of Opposition. Suddenly, and without any effort on their part, they found themselves brought into the Cabinet as a balancing factor and they have been basking in the sunshine of high office. They clung to it as long as they could. Should we not have done the same? But the end has now come. Their supporters in the constituencies have pushed them out. Free Trade Liberalism, though so sorely routed at the polls a year ago, lives on in parts of England, Scotland and Wales. The survivors are men and women to whom the tenets of Cobden are almost as sacred as the Tables from the Mount. They are sincere souls, very vocal in their sincerity, and they have now succeeded in leading the two dissentient Liberal Ministers to resign office. Certain Liberal under-secretaries go with them; they are good enough men, but have no outstanding parliamentary or public status. Outside their own constituencies the public hardly knows their names or offices. These dissentients will now return to the benches in the House of Commons below the Gangway, the very benches from which, in those fateful years for British solvency, 1929-1931, they gave just enough support to Socialism to keep it in office. Their motives were doubtless of the best, but we now see that the effect in the National interests was calamitous. Those are the benches to which the dissentients will now return.

In the constituencies there will, for the most part, be little change. At the last election, National Government members had Free Trade Liberals put up against them.

These Free Trade Liberals more often than not carried a coupon letter from Sir Herbert Samuel. A mere handful of them won their elections—30 in a house of 615. What happened last year in this respect will happen again. If Free Trade Liberal Party funds permit there may be more of these Free Trade Liberals at the next election, but the electoral position is not substantially changed.

As to the Ministry, the places of the two dissentient Cabinet Ministers in the House of Commons will presumably be filled by other Liberals who, like Sir John Simon and Mr. Runciman, have the National outlook. The under-secretaries can be replaced with little trouble, except the difficulty of choosing from so large a field of eligible men. The National Government of Conservative, Liberal and Labour Members will proceed. One English journalist who brightens our drab life on the principle of "Each day its daily thrill" has, when visiting Canada, foreseen the resignation of the British Prime Minister. In imagination, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald has even been sent up to the House of Lords. R.M.G.—Ramsay Must Go. Another prophet sends Mr. Baldwin back to his Worcester pigs. B.M.G.—Baldwin Must Go. A third prophet puts Mr. Neville Chamberlain into Mr. Baldwin's place as leader of the Conservative Party. Such speculations fill many columns of the popular press. Well, it is often the unexpected that happens in politics everywhere, but those who prefer to keep near to the facts and probabilities of the present situation may see little sign that the National Government has lost its momentum. The vast body of the public still stands behind it. At elections, it is not so much for something as against something that the masses of the electors vote. "The against" is as strong as it was a year ago. The menace of Socialism and bankruptcy for everyone who has anything saved, anything to lose, has still to be watched and diverted. The future has to be kept secure for the millions of men and women who are depositors in the Savings Banks, Benefit Societies, Building Societies and the rest. Production has to overcome unemployment.

The menace and the hope unite as they did a year ago. A year ago the Socialists laughed at the menace and their allies of 1929-1931, the Free Trade Liberals derided the hope. You know what their fate was at the hands of the nation. Putting aside as far as one can party feelings, and trying to look at the facts as they stand, I would say that the National Government seems to me as secure as any Govrnment can be in this changing world. As its leader, Mr. MacDonald, has the immovable support of Mr. Baldwin, and Liberal statesmen of the highest standing are his contented allies. The fight for the cause of Empire has been long and arduous. It has now been won, and won as surely as the cause of Free Trade was won three generations ago. It has been won on broad national and Empire lines. For fighting, we must now substitute working. We must see to it that the Ottawa agreements, having been passed into law, are honourably observed and carried into effect in the spirit as well as the letter. Points of view will differ, interpretations of phrases may not always agree, friction may result from sectional interests, but the steady national purpose of Britain, as in Canada and elsewhere, must and will prevail, and lead to an understanding of each other's difficulties and find a solution which is just and fair to both sides. Under the statue of Westminster our Empire has become in the political sphere an Empire of consent and good-will. It must be made no less so in the economic sense. We are partners in a great heritage. And what we seek together to do is to cure our economic troubles by living within our means, by eliminating waste, by a reasonable regulation of supply, by the alleviation and ultimate removal of undue fetters on the flow of trade—all this can be done for themselves by other nations whose Ministers assemble shortly at the World Economic Conference. Then indeed, in Lord Hailsham's words, the Empire, whose exertions saved the world in time of war, may save the world by its example in time of peace. I thank you. (Loud applause.)

CHEMISTRY IN WAR TIME

AN ADDRESS BY SIR JAMES IRVINE, C.B.E., F.R.S.

Tuesday, October 18, 1932.

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

SIR JAMES IRVINE: My first words must be words of gratitude to you for affording me this opportunity of meeting you and being your guest to-day. If I plunge into my subject without any more preliminaries you will forgive me. It was perfectly true, tragically true, that in the years succeeding the Great War many people suffering bereavements and afflicted with troubles and losses, domestic and otherwise, were tired of the name of War and could not bring their minds to dwell upon it. One can understand that attitude because it is too well justified. In the words "Lest we forget" there is a warning, and to that warning we must pay attention. We must not forget the war. We must not forget the sacrifices then made. We must not allow all that heroism and fortitude to be swallowed up in dwelling exclusively on the economic and financial consequences of the war. You will remember that in the early period of the war Mr. Lloyd George, in making one of his most brilliant and stirring speeches, used the expression, "This is a war of engineers." Now, with that I can hardly agree. It was a war of soldiers, and all other forms of help were really only incidental to the work of the soldier, the man with the gun and bayonet. But if it was a war of engineers, surely it was also a war of physicians and surgeons, and to an equal extent a war of chemists. Remember it is not sufficient to create an army. An army must be equipped; it must be drilled, and in wartime the soldier has to live under artificial conditions, conditions which are opposed to the preservation of health. The soldier must be nourished, sustained and comforted when wounded so that the work falls on every soldier.

My belief is that through the whole story of civilization, chemistry runs like a scarlet thread throughout the entire fabric. It is the chemist who produces the deadly shells, the deadly gas. It is also the chemist who controls the purity of the foodstuffs necessary to maintain huge armies in modern warfare. It is the chemist who provides the anaesthetics which tend so much to alleviate pain, and as the Great War progressed it was the chemists who were called upon to face unexpected problems which arose, and one of the greatest problems was to meet the unknown poison sent over by the Germans, and it was the chemist that was asked to provide means for justifiable retaliation. These things are generally recognized. From the beginning of the last Great War, the chemical factories worked night and day; no task was too stupendous, too dangerous for them to undertake.

I would like to call your attention to another form of chemical research which proved of vital importance to our army during the war. In recollection or imagination we go back to the summer days of 1914. I would ask you to picture me working in my laboratory, engaged in the most peaceful form of chemical research work, namely dealing with the rare sugars. I was concerned with a very obscure thing which registered under the name of dulcitol. It was a chemical rarety, and I became fascinated with it, and indeed broke off part of my holidays to prosecute that research. At that time there was no thought in my mind that I was preparing myself to play a part in the great conflict of the nations of the world. Little did I dream that in a very few weeks after the opening of the war this material called dulcitol was going become such an important factor on behalf of the nation. This material, dulcitol, sprung into a position of first importance. It was material on which the bacteriologists depended so much as a preventive against typhoid fever and other fevers. The lesson was known. We had that grisly lesson from the Boer War, where it was calculated that more men fell from typhoid fever than by shell or bullet. We had the lesson in the Russian-Japanese War, and our bacteriologists had to be trained on the necessary materials with which they had to work. This material, however, was not forthcoming. It was manufactured almost exclusively in Germany. I don't wish to romance. I know there were many factors which dictated the date of the great war, but I shall never have the conviction removed from my mind that one of the factors was that Germany believed that the British Empire would be unable to provide this bacteriological sugar on which the troops would so largely depend. Within a few weeks of the opening of hostilities dulcitol was being searched for all over the world. Even a few grammes of this compound were in sore demand. An ounce of this material was costing £20 sterling. We could not get dulcitol, and it was at this stage that an appeal was made to the university, so you can see, gentlemen, that the situation was desperate. It was at that stage that I was called away in order to organize the direction and preparation of this material. I don't wish to take up your time by going into too many details, but sufficient for me to tell you that my task was to try and produce or find an artificial method of making dulcitol. That had been done once before by an eminent German chemist who had succeeded in preparing something like the fifth part of an ounce, which process had cost over £100. We required dulcitol at the rate of five pounds per week, but when the claims of France and Russia had to be met that figure reached as high as fifteen pounds per week. To make a long story short, I succeeded in working out a method of preparing dulcitol that proved to be successful, and immediately the quadrangles of St. Andrews University were invaded. Work shops were erected all over, and this venerable old university became the scene of great activity, and under my direction dulcitol was produced. In eighteen months we were successful in providing not only a substitute for dulcitol, but actually the same compound, identical in every respect with the natural drug. In due course a factory was erected to undertake this work, and I could see the day drawing very close when our bacteriologists would have no difficulty whatever in getting enough of this material. New and still more complicated demands were made on the bacteriologists, and still more sugar was needed. At last we discovered that a natural source of this material lay in the fibres of the dahlia, and instantly we set to work to get these flowers in large quantities. Boy Scouts rendered magnificent work in this respect, and in the early part of July, 1915, we were busily employed extracting this valuable material from the dahlias which arrived in barrels, crates, boxes, and every kind of receptable. Appeals were made through the press and met with a wonderful response. This reminds me of the old lady who sent me some of her finest dahlias which she said had won for her many prizes at the local horticultural shows. She was a competitor each year, and it was with some misgivings that she sent me on the flowers. In a letter she requested me to tell her if her particular dahlias produced better material than the ordinary dahlias. I did not tell her because everything went into the mincing pot. (Laughter.)

In the summer of 1916 there were fewer dahlias in the gardens of England and other parts of Great Britain, but at the same time there were fewer victims of meningitis and other deadly troubles. While this work was going on, another demand had arisen for drugs. These are complicated substances and the supplies had failed. Of all these anaesthetic drugs the greatest demand was for a material known as novocaine, a local anaesthetic which for many reasons is an extremely useful drug, especially on the battle field and in the hospitals. A large amount of novocaine was required and we were called upon to produce it. I am not here to boast, but I can best crystallize the results when I say forty laboratories were engaged in this all important, nay vitally important work. The factory where I worked produced more than one hundredweight. I quote that as merely an example of how a task of that kind was undertaken and successfully accomplished. It required skilled work to carry on the mechanical work of the war, but it also required the skill work—the skilled hand and brain to meet such emergencies as I have described.

We had in our possession the German methods of making novocaine. But why is it that many people thought the German methods were best because they happened to be German? Our particular policy was to train our chemists in this great work—train them as to its importance and use unskilled people to carry out the routine work, which was done largely by volunteers. I take off my hat to these gallant volunteers. Sometimes I was apt to be critical, perhaps a little too critical, of the young lady who might be described as the golfing girl—the young lady who, after a brilliant round of golf, played equally as well a game or two of bridge in the evening and danced with grace at the fashionable ball. Never again will I criticize them, because my tempory factories were staffed by golfing girls. (Applause.) They worked seven days a week during these terrible testing times. They worked all day. There was no night shift, but their hours were long and trying. I shall never forget thinking that there had been many scenes enacted in the chequered history of St. Andrews, but surely nothing more striking than the scenes I then witnessed. To see these people, sometimes disfigured with chemicals, exhausted with the heat, suffering from tempory anemia from breathing the anaesthetic fumes, struggling at work—was a moving spectacle. It was a triumph of human fortitude and endurance which showed what spirit can accomplish. (Applause.)

There is just one lesson I would like to urge before passing to another phase of chemist's work in war time. It is a message which applies equally to Canada as well as any other nation. No nation can ever allow itself to become dependent scientifically on other nations. We must be scientifically self-supporting or disaster will assuredly follow. (Applause.) May I intervene with one word of local or Dominion application. It is to me of immense delight to see the progress which has been made recently in scientific research, and more of late in the Dominion of Canada. You have in Ottawa to-day a very great research institute, and a National Research Council. You have in Toronto other research institutions seconding this, and the great university work actively bringing together information which will be of immense service to the nation as a whole, which will be of immense service to the Empire. From all the indications it appears that in a very short time Canada will be scientifically self-supporting. (Applause.) I would not have you think, gentlemen, that when I was engaged in the work which I have so feebly described to you I was altogether indifferent to what was going on. I was certainly actively engaged with the chemical compound. I was interested in it and I was proud that I had been of some service to the nation. At the same time, there is a spirit inherent in mankind which makes men long to join in the practical issues of warfare. One cannot forget that the first duty of the soldier is to incapacitate his enemy, and the opportunity came to the chemist with a clear conscience. It came after that tragic trial in 1915, when without warning and in defiance of her own pledged word, the German army poured waves of chlorine gas over on to our troops. One does not care to talk in Canada much about that. I hope you know, gentlemen, that it will never be forgotten that the Canadians bore the brunt of that attack. It is impossible to picture that scene in imagination, to see these men, trained to endurance, trained to high explosives, trained to suffer innumerable shocks, to be suddenly overwhelmed, as undoubtedly they were that day, by the unknown, by choking suffocating gas. It was enough to put the fear of death into the strongest hearts, to daunt and overwhelm the courage of the bravest troops. It is almost inconceivable, and it spoke volumes for human fortitude that the troops were able to live through that awful ordeal and nerve-wracking strain. It is impossible to account for the way the Canadians stood their ground that day. But they did so, and it will redound to their everlasting credit. (Applause.)

But this gas used by the Germans that day came as no surprise to chemists. Chemists know the great powers which are committed to them as the result of research and study. Do you remember the interesting book written by Wilkie Collins in 1867—The Woman in White—wherein one of his most delightful characters, a great chemist, after dwelling in a conversation on all the horrors and destruction which could be accomplished by chemicals took consolation in the fact that chemists were after all harmless—the most harmless of mankind? (Applause.) Never before in the world's history did chemists realise as much as during the progress of the war the powers committed to them. As the war progressed every chemist was thinking how he might utilize these powers in warfare. There was the Hague Convention of 1907, in which all the nations had bound themselves to abstain from any form of warfare in which poisonous gas explosives were used. Germany had signed that. Not only was she a signatory, but she was one of the nations who had proposed that no explosives of that kind be used. Great Britain had also signed it, but with the proviso that if any nation broke that contract it would reserve the right for reprisals. These first German attacks were crude in the extreme, and the respirators which our troops wore to combat the deadly gas fumes were but clumsy things, but by and by the PH helmet was introduced, and after that a much more scientific respirator, and our troops then seemed to be adequately protected. There then arose the cry about the righteousness or unrighteousness of reprisals. If we had not adopted reprisals in the war there would have been no alternative but surrender.

And then came the next phase, when cloud gas was replaced by gas shelling so that poisonous gas could be distributed at longer ranges and independent of the configuration of the ground or of the wind. All nations by this time were eagerly seeking an ideal gas. In scientific terms the ideal gas is gas which keeps low, and in warfare it is the gas that is preferable to any other. This gas, without smell and heavier than air, was the gas that was wanted, gas which did not produce choking or blinding sensations, and did its work, its deadly work, without its victim being conscious of its presence. That is the ideal gas. It is a dreadful gas, but that ideal gas has not been discovered. During the War we came near it in the production of a gas known as phosgene. The respirators issued to our troops were satisfactory in the year 1917, and we gave the enemy as much as he was giving us, and I would say a little more. Our respirators were better than his kind, and the situation seemed more satisfactory until suddenly and without warning the War entered on an entirely new and sinister phase. I refer to the use of that substance which goes under the name of mustard gas. It was used near Ypres, and the town was filled with the contents of these cruel cross shells. We had not the slightest idea what the contents of these shells were. Most of the casualties occurred not only in Ypres but almost behind it. Men died in dugouts who had never been near the line at all, so deadly was this gas. At last we found out what it contained. We found what the contents of these mysterious shells were. It was not a typical shell gas at all. It was a dark brown oily liquid which lay about the ground and persisted and in the end got its victim. You think of the powers of an ordinary gas shell if you are hit by a splinter. The air is poisoned in your vicinity for the time being, but it is different with this deadly gas because it lies upon the ground and a man's hands and feet can become poisoned. You get it on your boots, and some of its symptoms are an acute blistering of the skin behind the ears. This persistence in the ground was the most dangerous quality possessed by this mustard gas. I would like to pay a great tribute here to the chemists who worked behind the lines, who worked in crowded factories. These chemists actually found out another type of mustard gas. They found it was not a new substance. They found out that it had been discovered years ago by a professor in Edinburgh, by a gentlemen of the name of Guthrie, and to me it is a remarkable thing that that discovery was made just about the same time when Wilkie Collins wrote that famous book to which I have referred, "The Woman In White".

Well, Germany had been preparing for at least three years for the manufacture of mustard gas, and we had it ready inside a year, and that is remarkable fast going. But what is more important, we produced mustard gas of more effectiveness than that produced by the Germans. We produced a gas and it was used extensively towards the latter part of the War. We prepared it in large quantities, and in the closing phases of the War, in March, 1918, the German troops were being pushed back. Their batteries were being plastered with drums full of our deadly gas. Add to all these things, and all that I have described, all the normal horrors of war and you will realize that the world was hastening to destruction.

Well, the War ended and some people talked glibly about the next war. Others are talking of disarmament, and I lay the problem before you. Is it to be war or peace? Are we going to have disarmament? We want peace in the world and is war to stop? Is it possible to effect any security, and will disarmament bring the world or save the world from a reproduction of all the horrors I have so imperfectly attempted to describe? Are treaties sufficient? I answer my own question. You as a nation may disarm; munition factories may be razed to the ground and all the munitions of war swept aside and demolished. A nation's fortifications may be swept away, but I say this—as long as the chemical factory remains, as long as the aeroplane remains, that nation can potentially re-arm and conduct a war based on chemical warfare. You don't need a gun to fire a poison shell. You can drop a poison bomb from an aeroplane. You can prepare the most deadly poisons in the guise of a perfectly innocent looking factory. There are many chemical factories, and in the course of a few years or more such factories could be utilized for the production of gas poisons. These can be dropped from an aeroplane, and their easiest objective would be the civil population. Now, I am not an alarmist, but I have tried to point out to you the great powers which chemists have committed to them and the deadly nature of the materials which they can manufacture. I am not swept off my feet by sensational articles in the daily press regarding the discovery of gas poisons of incalculable potency. I know they don't exist to-day, but, as I said, one cannot tell or plumb the resources of chemistry. I have such a perfect faith in the powers of chemistry, in the inexhaustible resources of chemistry that I view the possibility of future chemical warfare with grave misgivings. Now, what is the cure? Treaties are all very well but treaties have failed. We have learned the inefficiency of treaties in the last war. Do you feel that I am running away from my subject when I speak to you in a manner which you might think somewhat pessimistic? I am only uttering a warning, and I say this that what is required in the world to-day is a change of heart. It is the only thing. You cannot bring about universal peace by regulations. Only a change in the outlook of mankind will do away with all the horrors of modern warfare. What does that mean? We have to take all these things and give them our deepest concern. Again I say I am not an alarmist. But I would like to see at any rate the civil population trained in anti-gas measures, for however much we desire universal peace we must at least take precautions against what may happen in the future. As the great orator Burke said in 1776 "to be fully persuaded that old virtue resides in something which is impracticable is a spurious mode of thought." My belief is for the time being universal peace is impracticable and to pursue it is a spurious mode of thought. But after discussing these difficulties if I end on a note of confidence you will realize what my attitude is towards human life. I have a feeling that man is imbued with a far richer and grander spirit than we give him credit for, and it may be that these terrible days of world depression are the first stepping stones towards the development of a purer and finer spirit. I take my stand with Mr. Baldwin who recently said, "I profess myself an optimist and I am an optimist because I am a realist." (Prolonged applause.)

THE CHANGING SCENE

AN ADDRESS BY MR. HECTOR CHARLESWORTH

October 20, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

MR. CHARLESWORTH: It is with very mingled feelings that I stand before you today. The events of the past three weeks have been such as could not fail to fill any human being with a great deal of pride and with some modesty at the thought of how much is expected of one. I myself had no idea that my appointment would be so favorably received as it has been by newspaper friends and people in all walks of life throughout Canada, but especially among countless people I did not know in the City of Toronto. Tearing up roots in Toronto, which is the bitter part of my new elevation, is a very sad and trying process for me. I had not realized that I had come to be regarded so much a part of Toronto's life, but I suppose that is natural. I have worked almost daily within a very short distance of the corner of King and Yonge Streets ever since July of 1887, when I was a little less than 15 years old, and I suppose people have gotten in the habit of seeing me on that down town beat so frequently that everybody has learned to speak to me and everybody has rushed to grasp my hand.

Very soon I will be leaving Toronto for good, but I shall be frequently back here in the course of business, I trust, renewing old acquaintanceships.

I can remember quite vividly that day in September, 1876, then just turned four years, when I arrived in the City of Toronto, and I think it is my most vivid early recollection—I can quite remember the funny little old

Union Station, since superseded on two occasions, and my first ride in a hack up to Bloor Street, which was then the northern boundary of the City of Toronto. As you know, I have written some books of "Chronicles", and even at that early age I commenced to pick up anecdotes suitable for the Chronicles, because I remember our neighbors in those early days. Our special neighbor was the Hon. Sir Frank Smith, and across the street was St. Paul's Church. The old building is still standing beside the enormous newer edifice, but the thing that interested me about Sir Frank Smith was not that he was a capable minister and eminent man in his country, but he had a most fascinating parrot, and I am afraid this parrot was a papist parrot—(laughter)—because when old Canon Givens would be preaching on a summer's day and the church doors and windows would be open, Sir Frank Smith's parrot had a habit of shouting, "Wipe off your chin; pull down your vest." It caused quite a scandal in the neighborhood, so finally Sir Frank Smith graciously consented to cover up the parrot on Sunday mornings. (Laughter).

That is one of my earliest recollections in the City of Toronto. I did not know at that time, being but four years old, or a little over—I did not know that within 15 years I would be scribbling ardently as a very young newspaper man.

The city as I remember it was broken up into a series of villages. There was the Toronto which ended at Bloor Street. You went north and you found the village of Yorkville, where I lived during my school days, and then you found Deer Park and Davisville and Eglinton, where I afterwards lived, and when you went to the east you found Leslieville, and away down to the east the village of Norway. And then there was Victoria Park where steamers used to run. Going to the west—there were Parkdale and Brockton and Bracondale and Seaton Village, etc. So the city of today as we see it was once divided into a large number of small municipalities, each of which had its individual municipal life when I first entered newspaper work. We have seen all that changed. I do not know whether it is for the better with respect to the social life of the community. What strikes me as I look back on our coming to the City of Toronto, completely strangers—my father had some business friends, but my mother was a total stranger,—is how readily we accumulated friends in that village of Yorkville. We were taken under the wings of Rev. Septimus Jones and his family, and I see right in front of me perhaps my oldest personal acquaintance in the City of Toronto—Magistrate J. Edmund Jones. I should say also, co-equal with him in that honor, is a man named Frank Hesson, who was our next door neighbor. Six years ago I had lunch with Frank Hesson in the City Club, New York City, and he took me up Fifth Avenue to show me a magnificent building he was erecting. He was then Treasurer of the Aeolian Company of America, and he is now, I think, President in London, England—one of the big business men of the United States. The whole survey in my mind shows how Canadians do get along somewhere.

When I came down town to work, articled with a chartered accountant with a view of being manager of my father's business—I had then no thought at all of being a newspaper man—there were two boys from my own parish who came down town about the same time. One was Harry Jones and the other was Ernest Rolph. We used to see a good deal of each other at the noon hour and, as you know, Mr. Jones of New York later was assistant manager of the Canadian Bank of Commerce and did a giant's work in London, England, handling Canadian finances at the outbreak of the war. Ernest Rolph has had a hand in the building of Hart House and other very fine buildings in this country. When I look back on those boyhood associates I am filled with a sense of what Canada means. Here were boys, none of whom had wealthy parents, who just managed to float along with the progress of the times. The change in the national wealth of Canada, in its resources of civilization, has been amazing.

Colonel Drew has alluded to the fact that I can remember the beginnings of the telephone. I do not remember the invention of the telephone, but I do remember quite well about the period of 1880 or '81 my father coming home to dinner and saying, "Well, I put in a telephone today" and describing to his children what this wonderful invention was. I do remember about that time being taken to Barnum's circus, the chief feature attraction of which was Edison's wonderful new invention of electric light, first promulgated through Barnum's circus, and a great curiosity. I was shown the wagon from which it was generated outside the "main top" as they called it. The miraculous things that have changed the whole fabric of civilization since those early events are too numerous to describe.

We all recall in 1910 or 1911 seeing the first aeroplanes flown by Count de Lesseps and Johnston and Brookins, expert bicycle riders, who had taken to the air because they had the ability to stand speed—all of whom died through air accidents—and that is only 22 years ago. That was only four years before the war, which brought forward the aeroplane.

On the day this hotel was opened, I walked up Bay Street with the late Sir Edward Kemp. We were speaking about what this hotel was going to mean to the City of Toronto and the change that had taken place, and he said, "Charlesworth, this seems incredible to myself because I have been using motor cars so long, and I had one of the first motor cars in the City of Toronto, but going through my papers this morning I found that in 1909 I actually bought a buggy." And he said, "I could not believe it, but there was the date and there was the cheque;

I actually invested in a buggy in 1909." When Sir Edward Kemp said this to me that year was less than 20 years before.

And so things have gone forward at headlong pace and we just accept them as we go along. That is why I am inclined to regard newspaper work as something conservative and permanent. While the size of newspapers has changed a good deal and photogravures and things like that have developed, the general methods of newspaper work have been more or less unchanged throughout my connection with them, which extends over 40 years. We are, so to speak, I think, the conservative factor in the community. Beyond a few mechanical changes, the personnel, the methods and character of newspaper men, remain the same.

Of course, newspaper work has become a much more highly capitalized business than it was when I entered it. My first experience was with the paper from which I am now so regretfully retiring—*Saturday Night*. As I told you, I was educated as an accountant, but when the mania for writing came over me I could not resist the impulse. It was necessary for me, if I was not going to be speedily rebuked for neglecting my studies as an accountant, that I should write anonymously, and I sent my anonymous contributions to the young publication, *Saturday Night*. One Saturday, the very first lines of the first column in that paper contained a little advertisement from Mr. E. Sheppard saying that he wished the anonymous writer who signed *Touchstone* to his contributions would send him his address. I sent my address. I was asked to call, and I, a callow youth under 19, was offered the post of assistant editor of *Saturday Night*. It was not as large a publication as it is now, but I took it on. I had lots of courage, apparently. Mr. Sheppard went away to Germany for three months, but he gave us a very able contributors' aid in my dear friend Joe Clarke, who later got me my first job on a daily paper.

(Applause.) That daily paper was the *Toronto World.*

Now, the *Toronto World* was a curious illustration of the old financial methods, not merely in newspaper work but in business generally. I do not suppose it ever had an audit of its books. It never knew whether it was solvent or insolvent. (Laughter.) It started on a shoe string. My future father-in-law loaned W. F. Maclean $400 and he started the *World,* and if the *World* had been conducted with proper accountancy methods, which I had been early trained to respect, it no doubt would have become solvent some time or other, but as a matter of fact it survived for 40 years, and was I think throughout that period insolvent. (Laughter.) But it was a most interesting office in which to get a training, because it was run in this way: I may illustrate with a little story. One time I was sitting in a theatre with another member of the *World* staff, a fellow with a very loud voice. A couple of comedians started a dialogue on money matter, and one said to the other: "You see its this way—you get it but you don't," and the other fellow said "Yes, you get it but you don't." The man beside me said, "By God, that is like the *Toronto World.*" (Laughter.) We had certain salaries named on the books, but it was doubtful whether you got it. Nevertheless, I do not think any publication had more loyal service or more industrious service than the *Toronto World.* A great many of the most celebrated men in this country worked there from time to time, and Mr. Maclean himself was a very hard worker. He never had a desk of his own, but would come and sit down at the corner of some one else's desk with a piece of paper and stub of lead pencil and write something. Then if he got restless he would get up and move around to another desk, but anything he wrote was pungent and something that everybody wanted to read.

In that old office was another figure who still survives—I hear from him—old Harry Smallpiece. I never knew until Harry Smallpiece got to be an old man whether he was bald or not, because I never in all my early acquaintance saw him without a silk hat on at all hours of the day and night. We used to make bets as to whether Harry Smallpiece was really bald or not, but nobody among the young fellows dared ask him to take off his hat and settle the bet. It was good fun working on the *World* and our office there was a place where everybody in Toronto used to drop in if he had a good story to tell—liked to rub shoulder with genius, or anything of the sort—(laughter)—but, of course, as one got one's training one looked about for fields where you did get it and get it. (Laughter.) So I passed on to various other papers until I reached my long connection with the *Mail and Empire,* on which I was for several years a reporter and later for several years City Editor, until finally, in the year 1910, I gave up daily newspaper work for good, joining *Saturday Night* and was sixteen years associate editor and for six years editor-in-chief.

In those early years I never made any money. I was 30 years old before I could seriously count on a thousand dollars as a minimum. But they were full of colour, full of life.

One of the historic cases with which I had connection, because I just happened to get the original tip, was the celebrated Hyams case and in connection with that case I may say that one of the murderers—and I have no hesitation in saying they were murderers—on the night before we were going to spring our big scoop, sent for me through his solicitor and offered me $5,000. to take to the *World* office and give to Mr. Maclean to prevent the publication of the story. I went back to my news editor, old Walter Wilkinson, and he said, "Is that right, Hector?" "Yes, there is $5,000 down at the St. Charles Hotel." I replied. "For God's sake don't let them know it," he said "We have to have that story in the morning paper." (Laughter.) We were afraid that the necessities of the office would supersede any feeling for the public weal. However, it was our story and it got published.

Another episode in my career which is somewhat frequently alluded to, was when by a little commonsense I did scoop all the papers in North America on the fact that the Welland Canal dynamiters were actual Fenians and not grain scoopers, as people generally believed. I may say with regard to that episode that the idea that they were grainscoopers and not Fenians was not started by the prisoners or their friends themselves, but there was at Buffalo a famous newspaper proprietor named "Fingy" Connors who had originally been a longshoreman and was interested in the grain business and was very anxious to fasten something on the union of grain scoopers or whatever they called them. Buffalo, being nearest the scene, sprang the theory—and then every other newspaper in North America—that the dynamiters were just striking grain scoopers at Buffalo who had done this thing to prevent grain traffic being diverted down to the Port of Montreal. As I say, the theory did not appeal to me, and by real good luck—I happened to know the New York frontier very well—I went over to the American side to trace the movements of the prisoners prior to their crime and had no difficulty, in half an afternoon's work, in discovering they were Irishmen and knew nothing about America and that they had recently come from Dublin. The interesting thing about those facts was that the crown authorities knew them all the time but were falling in with the grain scooper theory because they wanted to find out the principals who had brought over those fellows to commit the crime. Perhaps I was not working in the public interest in going out on "my own" and identifying those men as Dubliners, because it probably did prevent the American government, which was equally keen with that of Canada to get at the facts from tying it up to the Clan na Gael in New York.

Those are just little episodes illustrating the colour of a newspaper man's life when he takes up as many lines as I have done. But, of course, the type of writing which brought me some little fame, and which is no doubt responsible for my appointment in some degree, was my devotion to my own hobbies. I had been always a lover of the theatre and even a deeper lover of music, and fortunately I came in contact with a series of editors who were willing to let me exploit my hobbies provided it cost them nothing, and so for a good part of my life I worked pretty hard doing the ordinary routine but at the same time plugging my best for music and the drama. And that, if you take it seriously, is one of the most charming and interesting of pursuits because, if you are a decent fellow, if you are willing to give artists a square deal, so to speak, you gain many delightful friendships. Gradually I have acquired friendships on both sides of the Atlantic and throughout America through people who would say, "Oh, when you go to Toronto you must know Mr. Charlesworth," and I can assure you that what I call the artists of the community, the people who give themselves, are a much finer class of people than anybody has any idea of. They are high strung, their temperment makes life difficult for them outside their own pursuits, but I have never known more loyal people than my numerous friends in the theatrical profession, and there is one thing I would like to advert to—the enormous improvement in the intellectual quality of the theatre which has taken place in my own life time. I know this is a bad time to make any special claims for the theatre, because it has serious rivalry in the radio itself, in the motion picture theatre, but the intellectual quality of the drama that is written today for serious production is very much higher than it was in the period of 1890. You can put almost any intellectual thesis into dramatic form today and if it is handled with sufficient skill and sufficient intelligence, then it gets some sort of audience—

perhaps not a vast audience from the general public, but from the many community theatres of this continent throughout Canada. Many of the plays that have run their course on Broadway—really intellectual plays—are being played through our Western provinces today, in community theatres created through that public interest in the theatre as a vehicle of thought which did not exist when I was a young man. In the matter of music and the capacity to enjoy music, our situation in Toronto especially and in Canadian cities generally has immeasurably improved. I can quite well remember Dr. Torrington's early efforts with the orchestra to promote orchestral music in Toronto. They were pretty deplorable. They were trustworthy but they were not for sensitive ears. I will not allude merely to our own Toronto Symphony Orchestra, which has become one of the finest in America, but we have in Vancouver a beautiful symphony orchestra, a very good one in Calgary, a commendable one in Winnipeg, a good start in Hamilton, a fine one in Montreal, and it is my hope that some day—not soon but some day—we will do more for those orchestras, and I have no doubt that the interest that makes them possible has been to some extent stimulated by the improvement in radio.

I am not going to say anything about what I am going to do because I do not just know. I have a theory only, but I am going to say something on just what radio actually has come to mean. In a survey of the changing scene there is nothing quite like it, nothing so widespread, nothing so intimate. I was talking to you about W. F. Maclean. After W. F. Faclean lost his paper I used to see him very frequently because he had a little office near mine and he used to say, "Hector, the day of the newspaper is done: I won't live to see it, you will, when there will be no such thing as a daily newspaper." I said "Oh, Mr. Maclean, that is nonsense," and he said "Radio will replace it." Well, I do not believe any such nonsense myself, but there is a colourable case for that theory because, when you come to think of it, the radio now enters into the home quite as much as the newspapers and periodicals. There is, of course, no home I think in Canada except of the very ignorant character that has not got some form of daily newspaper or some form of weekly newspaper—even on the farms the daily newspaper exists where it was not to be found 40 years ago, and the periodical as we know from our own particular business has gained a tremendous hold in Canada. Canadian periodicals, the aggregate circulation of which is quite enormous, are a great credit not only to the publishers but to the people who are their readers, because they are written for an intelligent public. Hand in hand with the newspaper and the periodical we have radio. The trouble with radio has been, as with nearly all our epocmaking inventions, it got off on the wrong foot. We know how that marvellous thing motion pictures was maltreated at the start, and it has been very hard to bring it up to a better level since. Radio was treated as a toy and nobody, until very lately, has seemed to take it into his head that radio broadcasts need intelligent guidance just as much as production of a newspaper. I do not for one moment subscribe to the idea that you have to get down to the very lowest intelligences in the community to render satisfactory service either with a newspaper or periodical or a broadcast station. (Applause.)

Before I sit down I wish to say something about the deep sorrow I feel in giving up the publication which has been my pet. It was the publication I started on and it has always been my joy to try and make it something fine and serviceable to the Canadian public. (Applause.) I have a right to think that in some degree I have succeeded in that, but I do not want anyone to think that *Saturday Night* has been a one man show. That is an idea I have had to correct among many personal friends. I have had as fine and well trained staff as any periodical—I am not going to say in Canada, but in North America—I could not go into the office of any other periodical in North America where they have a small staff so efficiently trained to carry on their work or as well greased a machine as I have in my own office. (Applause.) I want to commend to you my successor—a man whom you have heard speak to you—one of the ablest men in this country—Mr. Sandwell. Mr. Sandwell is a very happy man to have such a staff to work with and such an institution to work with. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. (Applause.)

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE?

An Address by SIR NORMAN ANGELL.

Thursday, October 27, 1932

Lieut.-Colonel Drew, the President, introduced the speaker.

Sir Norman Angell: About a year ago, a United States editor said to me that Great Britain might settle her debt to the United States by selling Canada to that country. (Laughter.) I said, "Exactly what would you get for your money? Are you quite sure that Great Britain could deliver the title?" (Laughter.) He said, "Well, we would get Canada; don't you own Canada?" I replied, "Speaking as an Englishman with a very depleted bank balance, I should say, decidedly not—we don't; I have an impression that Canada is owned by Canadians, and by nobody else whatsoever. (Hear, hear. and laughter)—and Great Britain is not in a position to deliver the title." This was before the Statute of Westminster, and I said, "That Act of the British House of Commons does not run in Canada, and Canada is now an independent nation that belongs to a certain class of nations in the British Empire." (Applause.) I said, "That is an old word that has misled you. The words 'British Empire' as used in the dictionary meaning came to an end long since. Empire is a form of political organization in which any subject Province was, in days of old, governed from the centre authority—the Imperium—and that does not describe what we call the British Empire."

Now, I am not surprised that the United States journalist thought it was feasible in some way for Great Britain to sell and to deliver the title to a piece of territory—to sell part of her estate as it were, because only yesterday some of my countrymen in England, speaking on this subject, said, "Don't we own Canada?" And I have been trying to pull them out of the pitfalls into which those words, "Empire ownership" and the rest of it, seem to have caused them sometimes to fall. Of course we are not an empire in the dictionary sense at all; we are an alliance of separate and independent states, and I am glad that the word "Imperium" has passed; but I do not like the word "Independence", because we live in a world in which no one can be independent, and if we believe in being a partner we must not also talk of being absolutely independent, because the idea that civilization is made up of separate and independent individuals is a contradiction in terms. You cannot have a civilized society where everybody has a right to do as they durn please—(laughter)—still less can you have it to-day. There may have been a time in which independence had a meaning, in which the world was not inter-dependent, rather than made up of independencies—because this is distinctly a partnership, and the alternative to imperialism is not anarchy; the alternative to the old imperialism, is partnership, federalism on the basis of equality. (Hear, hear.) I want to concede everything that you demand in the way equality, but you must be careful not to confuse equality and partnership.

We must remember that we live in a world in which that thing won't work. For instance, it won't work on a modern motor car road. There may have been a time when it did. Now, on a modern road, with a Ford travelling 60 miles an hour, it is rather important to know what the other fellow is going to do, whether he is driving on the right hand or the left, and if you don't know that, and there is a mix-up, the discussion as to whether it was 60 miles is likely to be academic. (Laughter.)

I think that those things have a certain relationship on general principles, to what is happening in the Empire at this moment. All my life I have belonged to the Left in politics, though I am no longer in politics; but I have always differed from my friends of the Left when they became so imbued with the idea of independence that they claimed it as an inherent right, a social claim, whether that claim be made in regard to India, Ireland, Scotland or Yorkshire. In our day it is anti-social to claim and assert independence. Equality, again yes, but not independence, because independence is the exact equivalent to anarchy and chaos, and our world at this moment needs, more than any other one thing, integration, coordination, cooperation, traffic rules, that the traffic may be kept moving, that there shall not take place these disturbing periodical depressions. (Applause.)

It is a curious thing that those democrats, those who make up a democracy in which I count myself, who laud Lincoln because he was prepared to see his country drenched in blood rather than that the Union should be smashed, who felt that the future of democracy demanded the preservation of the principle of unity, and faced the great war to that end—the preservation of unity—do not hesitate also to laud the principle of independence. He did not accept the principle of independence. He saw that so apt is mankind to quarrel, so strong are the tendencies to disruption and disintegration, that if democracy were to survive he had to preserve anything calculated to consolidate the Union that had been torn in the strains of separation and war. For the same reason I say that this thing we call the British Empire should be made of equality for the different parts. I do not claim independence, for that claim is anti-social in these days of disintegration, and in the difficult task of organizing a workable world we need to preserve everything that is worth preserving, and to look for every indication of unity in these days when mankind is looking upon social independence as a workable thing.

In this Empire these tendencies to disintegrate grow. Look around Europe and you see revolution, nationalism, and their historical hatreds, and the nursing of those old hostilities and those traditional feuds that go all through, and one sees plainly that the old attitude, unless it can be checked, must divide civilization. I have said often that that type of nationalism which we see in Europe is the enemy of civilization. (Hear, hear.) Let us beware of the same thing creeping into our relationships. I have always stood for the right of Ireland to Home Rule, to Dominion Status; but what happens when you get independence? You get two new territories—physical as well as political. And now Scotland is beginning to talk about Scotland as a nation. Of course we shall have a new territory in the North. And I was sorry to hear that the other day they discovered an old lady in Cornwall who talked ancient Cornish. I said the next phase of that will be "Cornwall for the Cornish". We shall have a new territory when Wales comes, and Lancashire may make it hot too. What is the end of it? Don't you see that must mean failure, for good or evil, of all that our inventions have brought into being? Our inventions were unmistakably intended to cheapen transportation and make the peoples of the world our next-door neighbors, and when it made these things take place we began to wall off these divisions.

I take only one thing in which that sort of world will not work. I take money. If we are to have a workable money, that is a money of stable value, it must, for the sums which were paid into an insurance company ten, fifteen, twenty or thirty years ago as provision for old age, it must provide for taking out the same equivalent of what you put in. But that cannot be if we do not now organize an international world. The money purpose has already broken down. It may fall into absolute chaos, and if it does, everything that we know in the way of mechanical large-scale industry will in the long run go with it. Modern industry demands a stable money, and stable money in its very essence means an international money. If our attitude is that as each occasion arises we will make rules, and that we will not be tied slavishly to the rest of the world, that means the end of our industrial civilization.

Power will not help us. I have spoken of certain ideas and expressions of which a critic once said, "This fellow does not know how dangerous those ideas are." The remark seems to imply that we would reduce the power of the British Navy, but I did not imply that. He implied that if it was not for the British Navy the foreigners would come in here and make a bee-line for the vaults of the nation and take away our material resources, and shatter our financial structure, and that nothing but the British Navy stands between them and that result. But in the last few years foreigners have been coming to the Bank of England and have been taking away their securities. (Laughter.) What has the British Navy been doing about it? (Laughter.) The British Navy has nothing to do with these things, and could not have. Taking the illustration of the motor car again, we have to make traffic rules, whether the other fellow is going to drive his car to the right or left, or we go to smash. The alternative is very simple. We either make an international world or we shall have a world in which my own country, at least, cannot live, and in which I think this country cannot live at any standard of life which we call civilization. You also are dependent upon stable money. The instability of that money may cause fluctuations in the price of some of your standard products. The price of Canadian wheat is directly affected by the money movements throughout the world. If those movements are uncontrolled, if they are chaotic, you will never, with all your plowing and planting, be able to get as much out of the soil as you put into it.

Now, coming to problems of the time, as an Englishman standing on Canadian soil perhaps I may be allowed to digress, not in any partisan spirit. But I would like to make a few suggestions as to whether the Imperial

Conference is going to result ultimately in good or in evil; and I will, if I may, suggest one or two tests. Perhaps the first point is the matter of bargaining between the various states of the Empire. That is to say, when we make a tariff, whether in Ireland or Australia or Canada, we do not say it is entirely our affair, and no others have anything at all to do with it. The Conference at Ottawa showed that we have got a little beyond that, and that we are to say that, after all, our preferences do concern the other fellow. As a matter of simple fact, they concern him so very largely that perhaps you will be required to talk with him about it, and see whether your tariff cannot be so constructed as to injure him as little as possible, and for him to frame his tariff so as to injure you as little as possible. (Applause.) This is the beginning of the obvious discussion which tests whether the Conference at Ottawa will be a useful thing. In this world, a tariff ought to make for protection to the states that make the tariff—beginning with the states of the Empire.

The second point I would suggest is that tariff arrangements between states coming together should be of mutual benefit; if not, I would see no reason or sense in that Conference at all. If we can keep those two principles together—that tariffs will be a matter of discussion and mutual agreement, and that they will be mutually beneficial arrangements between states, it will be a very hopeful beginning.

Now, as an Imperialist I desire to say to Canada that I want the Empire—that kind of Empire—to be as large as possible. If you heard that Australia or any other Dominion had withdrawn from the Empire and ceased to be part of it, you would regret it. So would I, as you may gather from my remarks. Very well; now if a little state outside the Empire, say Scandinavia, comes to us and says, "We want to join your club; for the purpose of economizing we want to be part of the British Empire; we will pay any subscription dues that other members pay; we will grant you every concession that others grant, if you will give us the same concessions; in other words, we want to be part of your Empire,"—can you say, "No"? There is now in England a certain Peer—who shall be nameless in this connection—(laughter)—one great Imperialist who wants the Empire to be as small as possible, and the more that can defeat the Empire the better—because that is what it means—so that when great civilized states of a high standard of living wish to join us economically, we have to say "No", without rhyme or reason. I suggest, with great diffidence, that that line of action would not be sanctioned by the British people—(Hear, hear, and applause)—and I want to know how the Imperialist can reconcile that Imperialism with the construction of the Empire in that way. If those two, three, four or five countries entered into mutually beneficial arrangements, and it is proposed to add a seventh, why should they not be mutually beneficial to such? (Applause.)

I have given you three tests, and if Ottawa stands those tests—I don't know whether it would or not, for the future is a little obscure—I would put this further simple test: Will the other States, knocking at the door for admission, be admitted, or refused? If not admitted, then we are not widening the area of trade; we are not breaking the barriers down; we are restricting opportunity; we are restricting the opportunity for my own country; we are creating a world in which conflict, not agreement, will increase—a world in which my own country—and I stand by Great Britain as you stand by Canada—a world in which my own country cannot support 45 or 50 millions of people on the soil of those islands. If it is true that we cannot admit others to those advantages it will mean that you are asking the poorest of the Empire to help the richer; and for that reason alone I do not believe that that arrangement will be accepted. (Hear, hear.)

Now, you see I talk with great freedom. I have tried to avoid passing any general verdict on Ottawa. I have simply suggested three tests or conditions to be made by us as individuals. If it is a beginning of agreements between states, after making those traffic rules of which I have spoken, that far it is good. If it is a beginning of mutual concessions for mutual advantages, so far it is good, and if that good is not limited by arbitrary barriers, it is also good. But if Ottawa is going to compel us in Great Britain to say, "We will welcome the Indian products produced on a Coolie standard of a few pence a day, but we must shut out those products produced by workmen at a standard that is just as good as our own;" if you say those privileges are open to the Indian Coolie but are closed against those English at the mouth of the Elbe—because that is where we began—looking at the conditions of a country like Great Britain, if we will be thus met with a demand of that character, and cannot for a long time obtain their acceptance, if that is the Empire, I want to say that I wish to see the Empire making arrangements that do not run counter to the great forces of our time, but those that run "with the grain" of our civilization.

We of the British Empire are supposed to have a capacity for facing facts, and there are two or three facts that I think we should face at this moment. The system under which we have been living has for the moment broken down. I do not know whether that break-down is permanent or not. I do know that it has been a gradual failure these last ten years, a time of great anxiety to people for years, and a time of great anxiety and economic instability over the world to-day. That needs to be stabilized, and I have helped to be a transformer. Now, there is nothing very radical about that, for anything that is living and growing has to change, and if society is a living and growing thing it must change, and as the world is a living and growing thing it will meet changes and transformations. I want those changes to be brought about in an orderly fashion, steadily, without violence and without hate.

There are two points about this relative evolution of our present system which I would like to point out.

Here you have seen throughout Europe and the old part of the world a break-down of the parties equal to a break-down of the economic system. That break-down has not been the work of Socialists or Red agitators; not in the least. (Hear, hear.) That break-down has been due to the pursuit of policies carried through by very conservative capitalist governments. (Applause.) In other words—excuse the extreme frankness of expression in this—the modern capitalist has shown himself a very incompetent defender of modern capitalism. (Hear, hear, and applause.) It is under his aegis, under the system which he controls, that this terrific break-down has taken place—this blizzard, to use Mr. Lloyd George's word, has come upon us. It is not now the Socialist radicals, as one Senator told us. Look across the border; there is very little Socialism there, you know—(Laughter)—and they think they may turn the edge of the storm. Capitalism there has had every opportunity; everything that we associate with capitalism has had a free hand, and this break-down has not been avoided.

Let us be realistic about it. Let us ask what it is that we have got to change. In what respect has change to take place? I have already suggested one or two. I suggest that it has failed because at one essential point, like that of the stabilizing of money, there has been no planning, no organization, no international agreements. It was dependent upon the Gold Standard for keeping up the level of monetary gold. We have reduced the use of monetary gold that we have created. We have failed to see that our tariff-making bears vitally upon the effective distribution of monetary gold. We have been sure when we came forward with our isolated tariff-making, each for himself, that it would have no reaction on the monetary system. It is largely the tariff making which has broken down the monetary system.

Our banks across the border have been saying for some ten years to the Europeans, "You shall pay your debts, and if you send us any more goods we shall put up the tariffs to keep them out. You must pay in gold." The result was that the United States and France, between them, accumulated about all the monetary gold in the world worth talking about. And what happened next? "You shall pay us; you have no more gold, but you shall pay."—(laughter)—and a hundred million of the most intelligent people of the world have not yet seen that they were asking the impossible. (Laughter.)

Do not let us be vain-glorious about it, because we went through exactly the same thing in connection with Reparations. After the war we spoke to the Germans about our 150 billions of dollars, and we said, "You shall not dump your goods on us." Well, every one knew how much the Germans had, and if we had got every pair of ear-rings they had we would have got about one billion dollars out at the end; and I put it to my colleagues in the House of Commons, "Do you expect those people to pay?" Many suggestions were made, but one of them had a happy thought. He said, "Give me a dozen Tommies and half a dozen motor trucks and I will go to Berlin and notify the Cabinet that if the motors are not loaded before six the next morning two members of the Cabinet, to be chosen by lot, shall be shot." (Laughter.) He said, "I would soon get the shekels." I said, "Yes, you have loaded your trucks and have brought that money to London; it is not gold, it is paper money which you bring to London, but what will you do with it? That money has value in only one place, and that is Germany, where surely it will buy goods; but you have laid down the principle that these goods shall not be brought into Britain, so the only thing I can see is for you to get this money back to Germany, and sit there and drink German beer until it is all drunk up." (Laughter and applause.) It took my countrymen ten years to see that point—(Laughter)—and the French don't see it yet—(Laughter)—and the American Senate has taken a solemn oath that nothing in the world will ever make them see it. (Renewed laughter.)

The education that has produced that type of mind is the education that has been produced by pastors and masters these last two generations, and has been devised, shall we say, by our capitalistic system, presented to the public in a way that will give the system, which they are supposed to manage, security and stability.

This leads me very near to one of my present hobbies, that ultimately this thing can only be remedied by a larger understanding of the nature of the world in which we live—(Hear, hear)—by having education bear more definitely and more consciously than it does, by enabling the masses to understand the nature of man and the nature of that society in which man has to pass his life. I am afraid that education does not always bear upon these points. The great need to-day is to realize that we are in a situation that is something like those present during a run on a bank. There is a prospect of the masses withdrawing their deposits, when feeling the responsibility for their families. The interest of the individual is opposed to that of the whole mass of the people. All would be safe if we could organize our own disciplines sufficiently to see that that sort of thing does not take place. We have to devise a social sense so that we shall not indulge in that way, in regard to the bank, in such a way as an excited individual would, and thus promote a crisis at the bank. What is needed is to understand enough of excited society and what is needed to be done to stop that sort of thing. Let us see if we cannot re-shape our education a little so that those who are coming after us shall understand this thing a little better; that we shall make of this great family of ours in the Empire a simple world of free states who know how to use their freedom, who are willing to impose upon themselves several obligations, certain "don'ts", if you like. At least we in the Empire should show that we are capable of those disciplines, that we are not victims of wild fears, and that we ought to be able to organize a workable kind of society.

I am myself a transformer of society, as I have said, transforming the old cruelty, the old violence, the old hate, showing that the new Empire, at least, has a dream; so that, beginning with the Brotherhood of Man, we shall make something more than an empty and windy freedom. Let us see that the newer generation gets such an education as will teach them to live in a scientific and not a sentimental brotherhood of man, respondent to intelligent direction, so that we may make human society, difficult as we have it, something more worthy than it has been of the wonderful mind of man. (Loud applause.)

PRESIDENT DREW expressed the thanks of the Club for the interesting address.

TORONTO UNIVERSITY AND THE PUBLIC

AN ADDRESS BY DR. H. J. CODY, M.A., D.D., LL.D.

Thursday, November 3, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

HON. DR. CODY: In speaking to you to-day I labour perhaps under two disadvantages; first, as I am always with you there is no element of surprise in my appearance; secondly, I am speaking on a subject that is quite familiar to you, the University of Toronto, an institution of which you have every reason to be proud. However, in spite of these drawbacks, I shall take advantage of every opportunity to offer to my fellow-citizens, as best I may, information of some of the activities of the University, because I profoundly believe that no University was ever meant to be self-centred as a seat of culture, far removed from the common people. Rather, it was meant to be a great servant of the people, training for leadership, training in the pursuit of truth, training in the possession of that informed and vigorous mind with which the citizen can ever make ultimate right choices.

So the University of Toronto belongs to the whole class of universities. It is our nearest example of this great group of educational institutions that for many a century have borne the name of University. After the Christian Church and Roman Law the university is the oldest institution in Western civilization. As your President has reminded you, the very name sets forth certain aspects of the original University. There were two characteristics of the original universities that came into existence in the Middle Ages; the first was that the range of study was supposed to be universal—all knowledge then possessed was taught in the university; and secondly, the university was cosmopolitan. The original universities were not confined to citizens of a particular country. In Europe, universities drew students from every country in the land; every university had a world outlook. I confess to believe that in spite of the many changes that have passed over the face of universities, the chief need should never be neglected, but through its various faculties and its many courses the university should be one of those institutions for the permanent training of the international mind. All students should have a world outlook. A university is none the less patriotic and national because it has the world mind, but it cannot teach or exhibit the finest type of patriotism unless it has the world outlook. Universality of knowledge and cosmopolitanism of membership were the characteristics of the original university and still are, but I wish to speak specially of what the University of Toronto is now doing, in illustration of the great functions that a university has to discharge.

Toronto University is a great deal more than a collection of buildings. It is even more than a collection of books in libraries and of equipment in laboratories. It is a great human ideal. It represents men associated in the pursuit of truth, scholars in association bent upon finding the meaning of things, the reasons for things, rewarded partly by the very joy of the search, partly by the joy of discovery, whether that discovery may have practical bearings at the moment or not, partly that through the services and through the application of their knowledge they may rear a monument.

Now, our own university is, to begin with, a collection of buildings. When I was an undergraduate we had in the University of Toronto two buildings, that which was then and is now called University College, the old main building in sturdy Corinthian architecture that is one of the architectural glories of this city and continent; then there was an old, shabby, quite simple building across the little stream, that bore the honoured name of Sir Thomas Moss, one of the most brilliant students and graduates in days gone by; the main hall called Moss Hall, where we held our meetings of what we called, I suppose by way of challenge, The Literary and Scientific Society. Here also were the quarters of our paper, *The Varsity,* published once a week, which afforded a vehicle of expression for many literary men who have since gained high distinction in the field of letters. The Superintendent of Buildings gave me a memorandum the other day showing that apart from the federated universities—Victoria, St. Michael's and Trinity—the buildings numbered about 60; and if you add the buildings in connection with the federated institutions of the affiliated colleges you have a group well over 70; and those material structures are the home of the University. Some years ago, an eminent Cambridge University Professor, visiting Toronto, was much interested in these buildings, which he called "Noble Educational Palaces," and he wondered if intellectual giants would live in these palaces.

What is the nature of the staff of the unviersity? No university can long remain in the front rank unless it has some intellectual giant on its staff. I would far rather have on the staff a smaller number of instructors, and pay them much more, if they were of first rate rank, than have a vastly larger staff which contained a smaller number of the first rank. I am convinced, after a long personal knowledge of the staff, that our University has one of the finest academic staffs to be found on the continent. (Applause.) We may well be proud of our staff of the University. One proof of that estimate is that every year numbers of members of our staff are approached by one of the great universities on the other side of the line, which can offer salaries that fairly stagger ours. Now, I may say this in the presence of my friend here who supplies the sinews of war for that University—(Hon. Premier Henry)—that, comparing our University for administration and teaching with any university on the continent, there is no University on the continent more economically run. In Harvard the budget is vastly larger than ours. In Johns Hopkins Medical School, where they have half our registered numbers, the expenditure is practically three and a half times larger. I really believe we are giving the fullest measure of value for the money that is being spent on the University.

We have every reason to be proud of our academic staff. Where all are so satisfactory it would be invidious to pick out and mention single names, for I might omit some who ought to be mentioned. But not only does the University consist of staff; it consists of under-graduates, and they are, in a sense, the most important part of the University, for the libraries and laboratories and all the staff and Board of Governors exist for the sake of giving the best possible education to these under-graduates.

What is the registration of the University? With the restriction in the business world to-day we should have a decided drop in registration; but that is not the case, and I believe our conditions are paralleled in most of the other universities. It would seem that many who cannot find immediate jobs in the business world feel that they are well advised to take educational courses, or perhaps go on with a university course; or, if they are graduates, to come back and take a post-graduate course, so that they may be better fitted when times do change. Up to the day before yesterday, quite apart from occasional students, the actual registration was 7,486, and before the registration is completed, leaving out occasional students and not taking in the students in Pharmacy, or Agriculture, or Veterinary Science, etc., we shall go considerably above 8,000, and we are at the moment 127 in advance of our registration of a year ago. In Arts, there are 3,750; in Medicine, 846; Applied Science and Engineering, 915; in the College of Education, 586; and it is one of the most important features that in the school of Graduate Studies, which is entered only by those who have their degrees already from some university, there are 619.

I would like to speak at this time about the general attitude of the students towards a university career. Sometimes, in days gone by, it was customary for those who came to the University for the first time to spend the year simply having a good time, and they indulged liberally in the social opportunities presented to them to dilly-dally, and take small part in general education for life as compared with social amenities. But you can have too much even of a good thing. After all, the main purpose for which under-graduates come to a university is to study, if not really for some definite pursuit—perhaps at a considerable distance—yet really to study, which is the main matter. The number of books issued to students fom the library desk was 65 per cent. greater this year than in the first few weeks of last year. In the second week, when they were settled down a little more, it was still 63 per cent., and in the third week it was 20 per cent., showing that the trend of under-graduate opinion this year was to settle down to the main business from the beginning of the term.

I wish to mention one item that will be of interest. For some years past there has been a medical examination of the men and women respectively, to see that every student who comes is in good health. Nearly every student took the examination to see whether they were taking too violent exercise, either outside or in the gymnasium. Before any student can take the exercise prescribed, or play in any game, there must be a medical examination. It is a splendid method for insuring general health, because many small difficulties are detected and corrected by this means. Otherwise a student will be handicapped all his life. Dr. Porter, Medical Director for the men, has already examined 2,025 men, of whom 955 are in their first year, and the general report on the health of those men is admirable. Sometimes people are a bit alarmed about the decadence of youth, but I wish to say that so far as physical evidence goes you could not have a finer cross-section of Ontario life than that which you will find in the virile and energetic and clean and decent young men in our Provincial University. (Applause.)

How are the under-graduates divided as to sex? Out of 8,000, a little over 5,000 will be men, and something under 3,000 will be women. Those are distributed practically through all the faculties and all the colleges.

As the University renders certain services to the whole of the community, it owes a debt of gratitude to the Government that supports it; and, speaking for the University of Toronto, I would like to say that our University can never sufficiently express its real gratitude to the Governments of the Province of Ontario for the generosity and the wisdom and the far-sightedness with which the Governments have ever supported the institution. (Applause.) As the University is to be tested by the men who make it and the men whom it makes, the Government will feel that the investment has been worth while.

First of all, the University is the natural centre and the culmination of the educational system of the Province; it reflects the ambition and the ideals of the heads of the nation. One point I would here emphasize; the University does not stand apart from the schools. If I can do anything in my term of office to bring into closer cooperation the different branches of our educational system I shall be thankful. Through my work as Minister of Education I think I have some idea of, and the deepest sympathy with, the problems in our separate schools, the elementary schools, and the secondary schools in all their variety, and the universities, as parts of one well integrated and linked-together system. The closer the University keeps to the schools the better for it, and the better for the schools. We are part of one educational system, and the University is the culmination of the educational effort of the Province.

Secondly, the University is the great testing field for personality and intellectual power. There, men discover themselves. Sometimes the process of discovery is fraught with unpleasant surroundings; a man may in a sense feel that he is not as able as he thought he was, or he may be invited to fill a position of unsuspected power. Do not imagine that in the process of this testing of the physical, the moral and spiritual sides are forgotten. Not for a moment. In the State University you do not directly teach religion, but religion can be lived. Some one has well said it can be caught, even if it is not directly taught; and I would like to bear testimony to the men throughout the staff—one can never be absolute in a statement of this kind, for no one knows one's self, even—that the influence of the professors mainly is not only for intellectual stimulus, but for moral decency.

Third, the University is the outward and visible sign of the homage paid by the whole community to the things of the mind and of the spirit. We are reminded how much life there is that lies far beyond material measurement. Here you are dealing with those things that really make men. The University is a symbol of all that lies beyond material achievement. It is more than a collection of material buildings; it represents the ideal.

The University exercises four main functions which I shall briefly illustrate. First of all, the University teaches the youth. Speaking mainly, this is an essential statement, though obvious; the university is the great teaching body, and the methods of teaching are manifold. There is teaching in the lecture-room, as now we have it in small groups, where there can be discussion, with question and answer; teaching by means of essays; teaching out in the field; teaching by observation; teaching by the impact of students, mind with mind, and the mind of the professor with the students; and teaching through all the personal contacts and surroundings that are met with in the University. The teaching is broad in the extreme, and I might say that there will always be on the staff of every university a place for the great teacher. A man does not necessarily need to be a great master in the field of research; some great teachers have not been great research men, and some great resarch men have never been able to express clearly what they have discovered; but there will always be a place for the great teacher. Looking back on my college days, I remember that we had one great teacher, Professor George Paxton Young—(Applause.)—one of the most inspiring and stimulating teaches, I believe, in the world in modern times, or, I believe, in any day. He left his mark on the higher life of the whole Dominion of Canada.

The second function is that of conserving knowledge. It is a fact that knowledge is conserved in our libraries, in the heads and the hearts of the staff, and in the minds of the students in the class. But there must be in every university a recognition of the fact that it is a great conservatorium where you can conserve the standards of the state, and the knowledge of the state, and the ideals and instruction of the past.

Then we are perhaps more familiar with the other function of the university to-day, that is, research. Both the staff and students may be engaged in this work, for we are trying to widen the boundaries of knowledge in every university to-day throughout the world, which is more or less being tested by the contributions to knowledge made by members of the staff. One can conceive of nothing more stimulating to the individual or to his friends than that he should be set upon finding out for himself something worth while to the world, either in the realm of pure science or applied science. Coming to the University of Toronto, we have been happy in the achievements that have been ours through the work of members of our staff. I suppose it is not invidious to say that in the staff there is one man who has done a thing that has gripped the masses of the people in palaces and in hovels the world over. The people have been liberated, and have picked up their work, and have been able to carry on because of the discovery of Insulin. (Applause.) Let us never forget the debt under which humanity is placed to Frederick Grant Banting by his labours. That discovery, more than anything else, has written the name of the University of Toronto on the page of world-wide fame. (Applause.)

There are others, but I can only mention one or two in the Research Division. I suppose one of the most eminent physicists in the world was our former head of the Department of Physics, Prof. J. C. McLennan. (Applause.) He was the first to liquefy that rare gas, Helium. I asked Prof. Burton, the present head of that Department, to give me an outline of what is being done in the Department since, by way of original research that will be of practical application at the present moment. Now, there is one group of workers following in Dr. McLennan's footsteps. They hope to make contributions to our knowledge of the structure of the atom. Prof. Burton says:—

1. Two phases of the work have to do with experiments which contribute to our knowledge of (1) the structure of the atom, and (2) the part electrons play in the conduction of electricity through metals. The first of these involves very elaborate spectroscopic work, while the latter constitutes the experiments at the lowest obtainable temperatures, namely, those of liquid helium. In this regard our laboratory is one of three in the world where such work is in progress, the others are Leyden and Berlin.
2. Experiments are in progress on the effect of strong beams of cathode rays (i.e. electrons) on colloidal solutions. It is found that colloidal solutions having positively charged particles are coagulated and destroyed, whereas colloidal solutions with negatively-charged particles are *not* coagulated, and may even be made more stable. As the human body

> contains almost innumerable colloidal solutions, a whole vista of work is opened up on the action of radiations on the human body.

Gentlemen, I believe that through this new era of investigation we are going to have many valuable results in relation to the treatment of disease. Now, at the moment, who knows what X-rays and radium rays do in regard to cancer cells? We know they are broken; we know they are destroyed; but cancer process is not known by anyone. The strength of the ray necessary to do that work is not known by anyone, and I am glad that the Government of Ontario intends to set up a physical laboratory in the University, and the emanation of probably half a gramme of radium cells will be put in solution for providing emanations of radon, and most valuable extra emanations will be carried on this fall, with a view to experimentation with those colloidal solutions in the human body. A whole vista of knowledge is opening up.

The next point in Prof. Burton's memorandum is practical at once in its bearing. It goes on:—

> 3. Improvements on the electrical set-up used for determining the amount of moisture in wheat will make it possible to determine the moisture in hay— or grain-mows or hay-stacks or in carloads of wheat without the removal of a sample of any of these materials.

The next paragraph deals with geological prospecting:—

> 4. Work is in progress on the application of magnetic and electrical methods to geological prospecting. This whole problem is still in an experimental state, but Dr. Gilchrist is developing new methods of attack.

Up in our north country, in the pre-Cambrian rock, the minerals are not deposited in regular rotation at all. Thus mining is extremely speculative in the north. There is plenty of metal, but nobody knows exactly where it is by the old method. Here is a method that will be practised in the not distant future—a method by which we can find out where the metals are.

The University goes out to the people. Eleven years ago, the University was serving 200 people outside of its regular day classes. To-day, it is serving 2,500 people in occupations, who in the winter season attend night classes, all of which are of University standard. These are not doing the work that is carried on by the secondary schools, and the 2,500 people throughout the Province are in addition to the 8,000 attending the University in Toronto.

Gentlemen, I do crave your united and increased interest in the work of your own University. Education, from bottom to top, is in no case a charity, but the soundest national investment that can be made. In days to come—though perhaps most of us will not get into much sterner times than the present—we will need every bit of brain power and energy we have to make the best of our opportunities. We will need an application of knowledge, high intelligence, and disciplined minds to discover and develop and conserve our natural resources. The University is the natural focus for such knowledge. The University ought to supply experts to lead in the original applications of such knowledge.

The University is yours, and it is worth while to support it. Your sons and daughters go there. Back to the Province of Ontario go men and women with some love for things as they are; for truth; for some purpose of sanity in mind and judgment, and some for leadership. I do not lay too much stress upon the latter, for we cannot all be leaders, and there is a great need of trustworthy followers. I was rather struck by the remark of the Dean of Princeton, that this craze for leadership may be overdone, and that the 30,000 leaders of those groups that move in different directions cannot well operate.

The other day I was looking at the Latin inscription up in the tower that commemorates the building and opening of the old University College. I was interested to see that even in those days the University was not a Godless institution, for there were the word in Latin, "With the help of God", and below were the Latin words—*"Velut arbor aero* (*creseat*)"—meaning, May she grow like a tree, as its roots go down in the depth of conviction, as it grows out in symmetry and achievement, and grows up in aspiration for the things that are highest and best. (Loud applause.)

President Drew voiced the thanks of the Club to the speaker for his informing and inspiring address.

BEING PUSHED INTO SOCIALISM

An Address By MR. B. K. SANDWELL, B.A., F.R.S.C.

Thursday, November 10, 1932.

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

MR. SANDWELL: I do not consider myself a stranger to this organization, for you were kind enough to invite me to speak to you in past years, when I was engaged in what may be described as a passion for increasing the respect paid to the Science of Economics. I do not know that that passion has had any important results so far, except one, and that is the result of bringing the appointment of an economist, more or less, to the editorial chair of *Saturday Night*. (Laughter.) I may say that result gives me the highest possible satisfaction; and in as much as the Empire Club contributed quite materially to the passion for giving respect to an Economist, I may say I owe my present position very largely to the influence of this Society. (Applause.)

I feel that the acceptance of that position materially impairs my oratorical powers. For the last seven years I have been a free lance, engaged in business for myself, engaged in selling the products of my brain, when it produced anything, to any one who could be induced to buy. It is an arduous business, and there is a good deal of freedom about it, and I am afraid that in those few years I developed a freedom which I will have to slough off considerably as I get deeper and deeper into the cushions of the editorial chair. (Laughter.) At the present moment I am about half way in. Still I feel like a free lance, and yet I feel that everything must be considered with great care on account of its effect on the circulation and the advertising, the prestige and the interests of the paper of which I am, after all, only a humble member. (Laughter.) So do not, I beg of you, look to me for any of that bright and frivolous kind of stuff that Colonel Drew referred to. I cannot use it any more; I have to talk as an editor should talk. (Laughter.)

I want to talk very briefly on the subject of the new world into which we are entering. Fourteen years ago to-day we were talking a good deal about the new world which we thought was going to emerge as a result of the ending of the war. We were inclined to be rather optimistic about its character. I remember Mr. Lloyd George having said that it must be worthy, and he was going to make the world fit for heroes to live in. Well, during the years that have elapsed since that undertaking, I do not know that it has been very adequately carried out except for the fact that it has required a good deal of heroism to live in the world. (Applause.) But as a matter of fact, gentlemen, the new world did not arrive for us after the war. The war was not finished in 1918. The economics of the war are now, I trust, somewhere nearer the finish. You are within five years or so of getting rid of the war economically. The real new world which results from any great cataclysm such as the world war does not arrive with any degree of rapidity. It is brought about, not by the mere war itself, but by various economic foibles and follies. The new world which we are going to live in—and which we cannot help living in—is going to be developed much more rapidly in the next five years, and I want to say a few things to you about what we may expect in it, and what we need to do to adjust ourselves to it.

The changes which are bringing about a new world are not merely in the nature of its political institutions. The abolition of monarchy in Germany did not effect so great a change in Germany as something else that took place several years later, and which caused fundamental changes in Germany, of the kind we are now undergoing in the rest of the world; for the most important factor in bringing about the new world is the great major change in the price-level. That great change in the price-level in Germany had the effect of making an entire revision of the position between the creditor and the debtor, a revision that took place with the change of the German currency, and altered the whole social structure of the people of Germany, as our social structure is going to be changed by the change that has taken place in the world more recently.

You gentlemen are largely business men, and there is a sad but inevitable tendency among business men to look at prices from the point of view of the particular articles in which they are interested, and the position of business in their lines, rather than as absolute and separate and independent phenomena to be studied by themselves. In other words, I think you have a tendency—I have noticed it among all business men in the world—to believe that price-levels are purely a matter of the demand and supply of particular commodities. In the case of the mass of commodities and in the case of the long run of movement of the price-level, this is not true. It is the movement of the price-level which produces, governs, controls business conditions. Business conditions have very little to do with the long run of price-levels. My views are merely those of the orthodox economist, that such conditions are the result of the ordinary run of price-levels and the demand for money—a demand multiplied by the proper proportion of credit and the demand for carrying on business transactions; and the interaction of those two forces meet a given result in business itself. But the actual fact of the demand for metal on one side, and the number of transactions and the size of transactions to be carried out on the other hand—are the two forces that govern and control the major movement of business conditions.

Now, we have been going through that since I last spoke to your Club; and this is a crucial fact, because it is more than three years since I last addressed you. We have been going through the greatest effort in the value of unit currency that has ever happened in the history of metal. In the United States—which has still the gold dollar, and there is some dispute whether we have or not—(Laughter)—the commodity price-level is about 33 per cent below what it was less than four years ago. Wholesale prices have declined just about one-third in a little over three years. That is an impressive enough figure by itself, but this figure becomes more impressive if you turn it wrong-side-up. For if you turn this figure you find that the value of the gold dollar has increased 50 per cent in the four years. There is no record of that kind in history. It never happened before. There have been sharp changes, but usually as a result of reaction from a strong movement in the opposite direction. There has never been a change of that kind in so short a time; and that change was not a reaction from a change in the opposite direction; it was a continuation of a distinct movement that had been going on from 1921, and which had led us from the high peak of that year to a much lower level in 1924 and 1925, a level from which the decline of 1928-32 that I have just referred to took its beginning.

Now, it is shifts like that in the value of money that bring about earthquakes in the social structure. You will find this as far back as the Middle Ages. All the grand social upheavals of the Middle Ages were preceded, and very largely caused, by violent shifts in the value of money. People at that time were not worried by it, not having any price index; all they felt was that they were being discommoded by the prices of the articles with which they had to deal. But such shifts in those days were not to be compared to the shifts in the present day, because in the last 150 years of the world, and most of all in the last 30 years, we have enormously magnified the amount of wealth, of value, represented in the world by tokens of debt. Of course there is no real wealth except goods. But the equity in those goods is represented, more than ever in history, by promises to pay, expressed in terms of money, dollars, pounds sterling. A shift in the value of money does not affect me very much, as my labors have bought the same amount of wheat, and that leaves me the same amount for my rental. If the prices of wheat have gone down or up I shall be very much where I was. I am assuming that I am a landlord who owns the whole equity on my land to be put into wheat; but if I am a landlord whose equity in land is overcrowded by a heavy mortgage, or the equity in whose factory or other productive assets is overlaid by a very heavy bond issue, such a change in the value of money is going to make a tremendous difference to the position, because it will offset the share of the business which the owner may take for himself, and he must dispossess himself of it in favor of his creditors.

The shift in the value of money has therefore become greater by the enormous increase in the value of documents for future payment in terms of money received. You will remember that practically through the whole period from 1900 the average price of everything began to rise, and bonds became the popular method of financing, and they became more or less extensively employed in every succeeding year. It was very nice for the borrower. The borrower was getting his bond, his equivalent for the land or real estate he gave in exchange for the promissory document, the value of which I do not suppose he could absolutely assure himself would not continue to go down indefinitely. But it looked as though there was no prospect of his having to pay himself in commodities, in the way of interest and return of principal in the future for the value of the commodities he got when he bought. Bonds became, for that reason, more and more popular until the climax came, when the interest which bondholders were getting was declining, and there began to be a move to common stock, and it was said that it was better to own a claim in equity than a claim in the bond issue.

Not only have we merely increased the size of the equity in our real property, represented by the bond issues, but we have almost to a startling extent removed the possibility of re-dressing, re-arranging, re-valuing that equity when it becomes possibly burdensome to the debtor.

There was another period of declining prices during the whole of the latter half of the Nineteenth Century, and there were a great many bankruptcies following the decline; but all that happened was that the holder, not being able to get his money, the actual dollars for which he stipulated, took over the document and got what he could out of it, the original holder of the property being eliminated. But the extent to which that can be done at the present time is very seriously diminished by two factors. One factor is the extent to which bond issues, credit documents, long promises, are now being put out on the credit of governments and not on the credit of a private corporation, and not on the strength of any particular body of assets of a private power company or private railway. After all, it is only railway concerns, with their annual charges devolving on them, that the creditors take over. I believe that 90 per cent of the United States railways passed from the hands of one type of owner to another type of owner during the latter half of the Nineteenth Century. But you cannot do that with a public undertaking. A creditor cannot hand over the Canadian National Railway to the bondholders, because the bondholders did not invest on the strength of what the railway possessed, they invested because of their faith in the tax-payers. They figured that they would pay the interest when it came due, or the adjustment of the value that was granted.

The other factor is the extraordinary growth of what I term the innocent holder of the bonded investments. By that I mean the extent to which the bonds of private undertakings are now held as a sort of price—enormous bodies of insurance policyholders and those holding all kinds of similar investments; those who have put their money into these things, who have not deliberately decided to take a chance on the prospects of an electrical power development in Northern Alberta, or to back a tramway system in Kingston, or anything of that kind, yet had their money put in these things by people who were acting as legal trustees. I have left insurance as reaching the point where it will be practically impossible to allow any very serious depreciation in the claims of policyholders, or the review of their policies, as a matter of public policy. I do not think the people would stand for that; but if it is necessary that the state should step in for the sake of individuals or the policyholders as a whole, I think the State would have to stand for it.

There are several changes which have the effect of increasing the opening, of pushing more widely open the door for the State, and throwing the creditors' obligation on the State to step in and carry on and administer and conduct the business which, owing to the change in the price-level, has become unprofitable to its original owners, and is unable to pay its debts to the original creditors. Of course increases in the price level tend to increase the scope of the State under any article in which they may come.

The fact that you gentlemen are owners of the Canadian National Railways—and much joy may they bring you—(Laughter)—is very largely due to the fact that there was a rising price-level during the years following the construction of most of those railways, and the earnings of those railways were so largely controlled—and I do not say that we, the State, are responsible for that, because on this North American Continent we own such a small financial fraction—the earnings were controlled by the increasing price-level, and some of the roads were forced into bankruptcy; but we saw to it, through our regulative powers, that they should be taken over by the Dominion of Canada.

The point I want to leave with you—and this is the whole message—is that the new world in which we are going to live for the next 50 years is still capable of being conducted by what you and our statesmen and the statesmen of the rest of the world can manage to do. If the capitalistic system is to continue—though I do not like to call it capitalistic, which is a term of abuse hurled by Socialists and Communists, just as Communist is a term of abuse hurled by Capitalists, and I try to avoid both—I would not say the system of Capitalism, but the system of individual enterprise, the system of competition, the sysem which relies on the profit motive—if this system is to continue, one condition is indispensible, and you gentlemen and your rulers will have to see to it that that condition is applied to it. That condition is a reasonably stable monetary unit. (Applause.) There is no other alternative.

You will have a stable monetary unit or you will find yourselves getting along with no monetary unit at all. There are two ways to do that. You can revert to barter, or you can say, by selecting a system, that the value of money does not very much matter, that money has no value except that which is assigned to it, as in Russia. Money does not matter very much in a socialistic system; the control of industry, the distribution of goods, is effected by other means. Money is a minor matter. You can have a socialistic state; you can have a primitive state of barter. You can retain the present system. But you must have a stable currency. A system which changes its value every four years is practically impossible. Personally I am not violently partisan to one side or the other. I do not think Socialism is going to be absolutely ruinous to us. You have a good deal of it in Ontario, and I think we can practise it with better success than the Russians, for I think we are better politicians and better businessmen than the Russians. If we have to adopt the Socialistic system I think we can live under it with tolerable comfort. On the other hand, I have no objection to any system of Capitalism. I like to be left free to make my own choice as to the things I want to get and the things I want to do. I like competition. I have a strong feeling towards the view that, taking men broadly and roughly, if you bring out the abler man, given him the opportunity to put his abilities at the public service, leaving less able men where they are, they will accept the direction of the more able men. I beg of you to have no resentment about profits. The idea that somebody may profit out of something has done great harm in the life of Canada, and is liable to do more.

Under a stable price-level, profits are the legitimate reward of individual enterprise and courage and industry. Under an unstable price-level, profits are very largely the result of chance. Every shift in price-level which decreases the value of what man holds, or does anything to bring it about, tends to bring the profit system into disrepute. If you are going to maintain the profit system, or the system of individual effort, you must see to it that the distribution of profits shall not be interfered with, and that there shall be no unjustifiable profit.

We are part-way, I suppose we are somewhere near the end, of the depression—the Americans have got through their election—(laughter)—and they can now proceed to do something useful. (Laughter.) In the past few months they have lost a very able government which might have accomplished something; therefore I judge we are right near the end of this depression. Anything they do will probably have some effect on the price level. But we cannot afford to go on relying on the accidents of American politics, or the accidents of international relations, or the accidents that may result every time an election happens. You can either rely on having those conducting your business affairs, the government, give us a much more socialistic system than the rather socialistic system that we have at present, or you must make up your minds to trust the whole unit of your currency to a government that will make up its mind to promote it with the object of making the price level stable. I do not care which you do.

I heard a very illuminating story recently about what was done in Russia in regard to some tractor plows. They naturally could not sell them, and they decided to distribute them on the basis of the largest mileage of plowing guaranteed by the various tenderers. After the tractors had been used for a given time, the Commissars went out to examine the work, and they found that the one who had made the best record was holder of a very small parcel of land, and he had made up for the amount by plowing this small space five or six times over. (Laughter.) That is an example of what you are going to get from people who are not out for the profit motive, but who are trustees of the community, the people at large. I do not hail with any enthusiasm an exploitation of that sort of thing in Canada, and therefore I am mildly in favor of a continuance of the individualistic system; but we shall not have it unless we have a stable price level. (Loud applause.)

The President expressed the thanks of the Club.

FOURTEEN YEARS OF PEACE

AN ADDRESS BY DR. WILLIAM HAMILTON FYFE, LL.D.

Thursday, November 17, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

DR. FYFE: Look back to 1918, to the ideals with which President Wilson at that time caught the imagination of the whole world. We still believed then in Reconstruction, in a New World; and both those who gave their lives in the war and we who now survive believed in the slogan "a war to end war". It was the only solace that made endurable that orgy of indiscriminate destruction.

What were our hopes when the war ended? We looked forward to a disarmed and therefore peaceful world, made up of homogeneous, self-governing nations freely sharing with each other the mutual benefit of trade and by means of a committee making and enforcing collective decisions.

How far have we succeeded in realizing those ideals? The answer to that question is inevitably discouraging, but as one looks back on these last fourteen years of failure, misunderstanding and recrimination, there are *some* gleams of hope. If there were none, it would be a waste of our time to talk together of these matters. I should like to review with you the fate of our 1918 ideals, which are still the ideals of most of us to-day, and to keep an eye well open for those gleams of hope. For while there's hope, there's life.

The number of homogeneous, self-governing communities has increased since the war ended. Fewer people are living under the galling sense of being in an unrepresented minority. Oppression is always a menace to peace. That menace certainly has not passed away, but it has been to some extent diminished. There are still, of course, some very sore spots, especially within the new frontiers of the central European states. Some nations are left still bitterly resenting loss of territory; others, who were before the war under what they resented as an alien government, with characteristic human unreason, practice oppression on the minorities now under their control; in others again peoples of different nationality, who made common cause against an alien authority, have taken to quarreling with each other now that they are free. There is plenty of gunpowder still lying about. And there is, of course, the open sore of the Polish Corridor. There are no problems so perplexing as those in which there is a conflict between two rights. Poland rightly demands an outlet on the Baltic: Germany rightly resents the separation of East Prussia. Until that problem is solved or forgotten it is hard for Germany or Poland to live in peace.

And yet, despite these risks, it is not, I feel, these problems of nationality that cause the greatest danger. I believe the danger from that source is less, or at any rate no greater, than before the war and that throughout Europe people are more aware of common virtues, failings and ambitions; they have a stronger sense of common destiny. Former enemies have met and compared notes and made friends. So there is one gleam of hope in a troubled and stormy landscape.

It was part of our hope at the end of the war that peaceful intercourse between nations would be assisted by freeer trade and the clear recognition of the fact that the world has become on economic whole of which each nation is a member, and that if one nation suffers, the other nations inevitably suffer with it. Here a review of the last few years seems to offer nothing but discouragement. Whatever may be the proper function of tariffs in the economic life of a nation, we can all see now that the excessive restriction of international trade has proved suicidal. As long ago as 1927, the report of the World Economic Conference spoke of "the hindrances opposed to the free flow of labour, capital and goods in the effort to obtain self-sufficiency". And yet every nation has continued to go further and further in that effort, from the apparently blind belief that self-sufficiency consists in trying to do all the selling and no buying. The results engulf us at this present. And yet, though economists and statesmen are agreed that modern industry cannot be independent of foreign products, and that economic isolation can only be obtained by sacrificing disastrously our standard of living—in spite of such agreement, no one seems able to lead us out of the maze, because no nation dare take the first step. Here the only ray of hope is shed by the coming world economic conference, which will be in fact another disarmament conference, since its aim is to reduce those devastating economic weapons, high tariffs and war debts, which, like all armaments, are equally dangerous to all parties concerned.

Just as no nation seems ready to take the lead in diminishing tariff restrictions, so too the hope of disarmament is frustrated by the fear that if one nation takes the first step the others may not follow. Suspicion breeds fear and fear breeds danger. And the danger signal has been made clearer in these last months by the claim of Germany to re-arm unless the other signatories to the Treaty of Versailles now at long last redeem their promise to reduce their armaments. It is thirteen years since that promise was made, and the time has come to keep the promise or to let Germany re-arm. What would that mean? A continued competition in aggressive and defensive armaments. And what would be the result of that? Well, between 1909 and 1914 Great Britain, France and Germany increased their expenditure on arms by about 70%. We have seen the result of that and are feeling the full force of the result to-day. In a world infinitely more nervous and disturbed than it was in 1914, can we doubt for a moment that war would result very soon? Well, you may say, Canada won't be dragged in. These are none of our quarrels. Who then would be the combatants? Great Britain and France against Germany and Italy. Would Russia keep out of the fray? Most competent observers expect that she would directly or indirectly support Germany. In that case Japan would join France and Great Britain and if that happens the United States would be found against Japan. Great Britain, France, Japan against Germany, Italy, Russia and the United States of America. Great Britain after all on one side and the United States on the other. Where would we be then? Oh, you may say, that is mere speculation. True, but remember this. It is a speculation which is only too likely to be realized and in any case it matters little how "the teams are composed" or who fights on which side. War, if it comes, will be equally disastrous to victors, vanquished and neutrals. Indeed, there will be no victors or vanquished or neutrals; just common ruin for all, as if a volcano had erupted over the whole civilized world.

Then look for a moment at the danger on our other flank. When the war ended, Great Britain and Japan were still allied by treaty, but in 1921 this treaty was abrogated because it seemed likely that if war broke out between Japan and the United States, Canada—and perhaps New Zealand and Australia—would join the United States against Japan, even though Japan were still allied to Great Britain. To make up for the loss of that treaty the self-denying ordinance of the Nine-power Pact was signed and also the Washington Naval Treaty. That was 1922. Six years later came the Kellogg Pact. Now Mr. Stimson has recently made it clear that these pacts and treaties all hang together. Japan has broken the Nine-power Pact and the Kellogg Pact. Therefore, unless the League can mend the breach, the United States is freed from the provisions of the Washington naval treaty. That means that the United States would build for naval war. So would Japan. And where should we be then? For it seems improbable that Great Britain would compete in naval armaments against Japan in order to save Canada. We might well become the Belgium of that war.

Where are the gleams of hope in this picture? If you strain your eyes you can see faint gleams not yet extinguished on the letters which form the words Disarmament and Collective Responsibility. Those are three words in which the one hope of our children's future is involved. That may sound a gloomy prospect. Let us at least look at the little that *has* been achieved.

The naval treaties of Washington and of London certainly disappointed many hopes. And yet from a pre-war viewpoint they were an astonishing and revolutionary achievement. For the first time, proud and powerful nations voluntarily renounced the right to increase their navies beyond certain prescribed limits. For the first time armaments were limited by international agreement; it was admitted that they were no longer solely a matter of national concern.

The limitation of armies is obviously more difficult and it affected far more nations. The representatives of fifty nations met last February at Geneva. That in itself was another achievement from a pre-war point of view. And they put forward just about fifty different proposals. Can you wonder that the discussion was prolonged and confusing and inconclusive? But before the conference adjourned two principles were adopted and their adoption give some excuse for hope.

1. Quantitative restriction is not enough. To reduce proportionately the numbers of all armies would leave the relative security of the nations as before. There must therefore be qualitative restriction as well. That means that certain kinds of weapons must be specially restricted or altogether abjured, weapons like long range

guns and military aircraft, which are specially powerful to break down frontier defences. That is the way to increase the sense of security, by reducing the power of sudden, devastating aggression.

2. The disarming of Germany was both qualitative—certain kinds of armament were forbidden—and quantitative—the number of effectives was restricted. So too, they agreed, must quantitative reduction accompany qualitative restriction and they voted for "a strict limitation and a real reduction in the size of standing arms".

That is the fruit of six months' conference, the adoption of the principles that certain kinds of offensive arms must be restricted and that the size of armies must be reduced. Not much to be thankful for after six months of discussion. But something. At least some ground for hope. It is easy to jeer but more useful to pray.

And beside these two principles there has emerged a fruitful idea. Disarmament and Security had been regarded as two separate problems. And no one could decide which ought to be solved first. But during the conference the idea emerged that they were not two mutually exclusive problems but two aspects of the same problem, and that the treaty by which the nations reduce their armaments must at the same time be effective to increase their security. Germany could build certain types of aggressive armament better than France and could put more men in the field. These qualitative and quantitative restrictions would make the French feel more secure. Italy is afraid of the big French guns which threaten her industrial centres: France is afraid of the growing population of Italy. The disarmament treaty can cure both these fears and thus increase the sense of security.

We can understand that easily in Canada, for our sense of security against the United States is directly due to those long miles of undefended frontier. If we kept guns there and military aircraft we should indeed be in danger.

The one real hope lies in accepting loyally and heartily the principle of collective responsibility. The principle that in international as in social life we should not take sides with either party when fisticuffs are in use, but should stop the fight and see that the cause of quarrel is referred to a properly constituted legal tribunal. To accept that principle is the price of peace. If we will not pay that price, we shall have war, ruin, chaos.

And yet I read recently in a Canadian military magazine a description of that essential principle as "an ideal concerning the relations of man which arose from the moral fervour generated by emotional anti-war propaganda". That is as if a professional burglar should speak contemptuously of the "moral fervour generated by emotional anti-burglary propaganda", or as if a lunatic should deprecate action designed to save his fellow men from earthquake or volcano. The fervour that supports the principle of collective responsibility is the fervour of stark realism, the fervour that faces the facts and without prejudice or self-interest calls for the action to which they point.

In contrast let me summarize a recent utterance by Lord Lytton. He said the Japanese had spoken to him and his fellow commissioners of the lives and treasure sacrificed to acquire in Manchuria the rights and interests which Japan claims there, and that they were sensitive about any outside interference in matters which Japan claimed to be her own concern. Lord Lytton goes on to say that he and his colleagues sympathized with these feelings and recorded them in their report to the League of Nations, but he added "there is one thing for which other nations have made even greater sacrifices, which they value as highly and are equally determined to defend, and that is the organization of collective responsibility for the maintainance of peace." That is the voice of common sense and such common sense is the one real ground of hope for us and for our children. (Loud applause.)

The President voiced the thanks of the club.

THE CRISIS IN THE FAR EAST

AN ADDRESS BY SIR FREDERICK WHYTE, K.C.S.I., LL.D.

Tuesday, November 22, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

SIR FREDERICK WHYTE: It is always a pleasure to me to return to Canada, because I know that here I can always meet old friends and make new ones.

My subject covers a very wide canvas, and therefore it can only be painted in wide streaks and generous strokes in the limits of a short address, and those present who are authorities on these questions will recognize the limitations, and eliminate accordingly.

It is necessary to place this subject in its historic setting in order to understand the forces which have brought the disputants, China and Japan, to their respective positions in the Far East. Fundamentally, this crisis derives from the changes wrought in the Far Eastern situation by the impact on the entire continent of the tide of western culture; and the respective positions of the disputing parties to-day are largely to be explained by the attitudes which they took at critical moments in their respective histories to the suggestions which the West brought to the East, and in the general response made by China and Japan to what I may call the challenge of Western ideas.

During the great war of the nineteenth century, the official attitude of the Chinese people, as represented by the Manchu dynasty, was one of resistance to the Western impact. It is true that large bodies of the Chinese went to the West to study the situation both on this continent and in the old country; but officially the attitude was one in which they intended to hold us, if possible, at arm's length. They did not recognize, in doing so, that they were refusing the opportunities offered by Providence for them to learn those lessons in leadership and statecraft that are necessary to a modern state. And so it was that not only the mass of the Chinese people, but a great part of the educated minority, were unprovided with political leadership, or in any reasonable way prepared for the gigantic task of social and political reconstruction with which they were suddenly faced when the Manchu dynasty fell in 1911 as the result of the revolution. And the principal reason why China has undergone such a cruel experience since the war is this lack of preparedness on the part of the very men who should have taken the most trouble to prepare themselves as leaders of the new movement which they established in China.

It may be said in excuse of that that the task they have undertaken was so gigantic that no amount of preparation would have been a guarantee of success. The fact that success has not followed the wide disturbance of order in China is due to the fact that the Chinese people as a whole were not prepared, mentally or politically, for the task of creating a modern state on a Republican basis. The only way they prepared was to organize the national forces of China and provide them with that material equipment necessary for warfare either in the military or naval direction.

The temporary result of this marked attitude of the Chinese people towards the tide of Western culture is that when they reached the crisis of war in Manchuria the other day, they were unable to provide themselves with the moral forces necessary to meet the onslaught of the Japanese, and they had to resort to other measures. Before I pass on to describe the Manchurian problem, it is essential to understand the fundamental reasons why the Chinese did not welcome the message that Western men brought with them in the nineteenth century. The Chinese, for a longer period in history than any other nation, lived under a stable form of society which had maintained its character substantially unchanged through many centuries; and neither invasions and incursions from the West, nor penetration into China for religious ideas, for instance, Brahmins from India, did in any substantial way change the culture and social structure of China. That being so, the Chinese were entitled to contend that their method of life had the sanction of age; that it had maintained itself so long, through so many vicissitudes, that there must be some natural stream of virtue in the particular type of society that they had created for themselves. So there came to be in the Chinese mind an arrogant attitude to all the other peoples in the world; and their very title—the Middle Kingdom, or the Middle People—denotes that they stood at the centre of the universe, and we and all the other peoples occupied the more contemptible and barbarian fringe on the outskirts.

Having that attitude of mind, being separated from the Western World by mountains and ocean and desert, they were not aware that growing up in the Western World there was another form of society with an infinitely greater capacity for the development of economic and political power than the Chinese, and that the day would come when that other society would challenge the right of China to close her door to western enterprise. Therefore the explanation that history offers to that attitude is that the Chinese had in fact established a perfectly satisfactory system for themselves, and they resented the intrusion because they disliked the contamination of the foreign ideas. It may be said for the Chinese society, with its marked traditionalism, that having had that touch with the foreigner, that introduction to western ideas, that China might have maintained itself politically. But Providence decreed otherwise, and the "Ocean Men" as they were called by the Chinese, on the shores of China, came bearing all kinds of gifts—some times so disguised that they were not known as gifts. The first to arrive were opium and arms; but the most important thing that the Western World brought to China was no material cargo, but an invisible cargo of ideas. While the Chinese dynasty was able to insist that the foreigner should not deal in lands, and should be confined to the coasts, not even the Chinese dynasty could prevent Western ideas from penetrating the country; and that penetration was the cause of the revolution.

We are sometimes told that the Chinese revolution owes its origin to the inspiration of the Soviet regime. That is an absolutely untrue reading of the situation, for we, the western people, were the original creators and the pioneers of national liberty. We provided the Chinese with those models of government, and those political lines which are the real parents of the movement known as the "Chinese Revolution"; therefore when we try to fasten these ideas on Lenin and his friends the answer is that as to the revolution which culminated in 1911, and which we assented to as disastrous, we were the original parents, and I hope we will not deny our offspring.

Now I will talk about the other side—the attitude of Japan. Japan took much the same view as China, as a people, and if they had been left to themselves they might very likely have pursued the same course as the Chinese, and held the Westerners at arm's length. But the fact was that about the middle of the nineteenth century the successful leaders of the revolution decided that they would restore the Japanese Emperor to his usual place, and make him a true sovereign. But they made a much more important admission at the same time. They were aware, as were the Chinese, of the military power, and one might almost say the spiritual power, of the Western nations who came from overseas, so that instead of holding those Western nations at arm's length, as the Chinese had done, they said, "We are to make an empire of Japan, equal to the other nations of the world, and unless we can discover the sources from which the Western man has drawn his power, from which he is able to establish those invincible states of Europe, we shall remain in a subordinate position, unable to demand or receive the prizes of international quality with the rest of the world."

And so it was that a man like the old Admiral went out to the sea with the idea that he could sink an American warship. He really swam out with his knife in his teeth. He wanted to get an object lesson as to the real power of the western world. He was determined to find out whence those western governments drew this inherent power. So Japan sent out commissions of inquiry to look over the situation in Europe, to study every phase of its organization, in particular manufacturing, politics, and military organization, and to see what lessons they held to teach to the Japanese people.

The date of the Japanese revolution—which is more commonly called the restoration, because it replaced the Emperor in his true position—is very significant, 1868. It lies between the dates 1864 and 1866 on the one hand, and 1871 on the other. So that the very moment that the leaders of the Japanese had determined to explore the secret sources of Western power, the one thing most prominent on the whole international horizon was the figure of Prussia. It was a curious but fateful stroke of Providence that Japan should awaken from her long medieval sleep when Prussia was teaching Europe the philosophy of militarism.

Within ten years the Japanese made a series of enquiries in Europe. They found in England a more or less highly developed system, based upon the idea of popular opinion, and they said, "We are not yet in sight of the millenium in Japan, and, moreover, the constitution we have just set up is expressly designed to place the Emperor in the very centre of power, and not to base the constitution in any way on the population". So they turned from England, but they carried with them one kind of lesson, namely, naval organization; so that their naval organization has been based on the English model. We can only regret that they did not learn other lessons aside from naval warfare, but they did not.

Then they turned to France, but could not see very much there, because the French system was based on a republic, which was far removed from the Japanese at that time. Moreover, France had just emerged from the Franco-German war, so they turned to Germany, and they framed their constitution on that model, placing the Emperor in the centre, placing the military power in a position almost invincible within the constitution, and thus setting the seal of German militarism upon the constitution of Japan. It was undoubtedly a fateful decision, of which we are seeing the results up to this moment.

To give a picture presented by these two, which I have tried to draw in as abstract a way as possible, it is necessary for us to bear in mind the features of both before we can decide the present dispute.

In Japan, the two fighting services, the army and navy, are both under the direction of ministers chosen from themselves. The civil power has nothing to say with regard to the two fighting services except in so far as the Minister of Finance is able to check military expenses; but the ministers of the two departments must be admirals in the navy and generals in the army. Nothing important can be done by the cabinet that has not the word of these two. If any cabinet undertakes a flotation without the consent of these two powers it is condemned, and has to go out of business.

How did it come that in the last ten years Japan's policy seemed to direct its course in violation of the League of Nations? You all know that original model was Germany. You also know that thirty years ago Japan and England formed an alliance which only came to an end in 1922. But in spite of the fact that Japan was allied with Great Britain, and fought as an allied force in the war, there were large bodies in Japan, especially in military circles, and even outside, that not only believed but hoped that Germany was going to win the war. You see, if they had contemplated for one moment that Germany would be defeated, it meant that the nation that they had chosen as their idol would disappoint their hopes, and the whole philosophy on which they had founded their empire would be defeated. But that is how it turned out. In 1918 everything that the military party in Japan had worked for seemed to fall, with broken pieces in their hands, by the defeat of Germany at the end of the war. The result upon the position of the military party in Japan was the shattering for the moment of their political power. So it happened that cabinet control of Japan's policy generally, both domestic and foreign, fell into the hands of the civil party, because it took some years for the military party to recover from the shock of the defeat. Further, from 1919 to about the middle of 1931, the successive governments, with some variations in temper and policy, pursued, on the whole, a line in which they discharged in a substantially favorable way their international obligations.

Then there came into operation a factor which is difficult to discuss very briefly, which you can only understand by studying the Japanese situation on the spot. As I have said, in their original decision the Japanese leaders felt that their people were not ready for parliamentary government. That was in the eighties, but between that time and 1928—about 40 years—there was a growth of political feeling in Japan, so that though they had divested their representative system from the outset by a narrow franchise, they had complete manhood sufferage. Progress was too fast, and while it had in the mind of Japan all the qualities necessary for responsible government, it disappointed the hopes of Japanese leaders; with the result that the parliamentary regime never had a sound footing in the public mind, and the civil authorities—in those years the Manchu—found when the test came that the growth was not based on solid ground..

The civil leaders were drawn from the circle of men like Shilehara, Inouye, Inukai, Hamaguchi, many of whom are now dead by assassination, a very significant fact. These men were thrown from authority for two reasons. They were made responsible by the masses of the Japanese people for the growing economic depression, which was costing Japan so much, both in her agricultural and industrial life, and the distress which has been so widespread among the peasants, the working class, and the smaller bourgeois, of Japan. This, briefly, was the result of the policy of those men who had been in office during the last few years. Therefore, they were discredited, until the military party was able to resume power, and the defenders and keepers of what appeared to be the foundations of the civil constitution suddenly found that the basis on which they had been operating had gone.

Not only did the Japanese public opinion make them responsible for the economic distress as the result of the world wide depression, but they pointed to the fact that those political leaders had consistently corrupted the parliamentary regime by the use of money, which was notorious through the public life of Japan.

The last straw came over the Manchurian question. While this condition of affairs was rapidly ripening to crisis in domestic Japan, the civil authorities of Japan, right up to the midsummer of 1931, were endeavoring to assume a more or less concillatory policy in relation to Manchuria. They made one final effort, in the summer of 1931, to make a conclusive settlement over the Manchurian railway situation, but the fact that they failed to get their conference to meet, and therefore failed to produce the result in that long-standing railway problem in Manchuria, meant that the last card of the civil forces of the people, ranged against the military, failed in a night.

I must explain the foundation of that situation. Manchuria is an immense and rich agricultural territory which up to recent times has been sparsely populated. Under the Manchu dynasty, the Emperors forbade immigration, because they wished to keep Manchuria free from the Chinese domination. They used the garrisons drawn from the deserts of Manchuria to garrison the towns in China, and from these the Manchu dynasty governed the Chinese people. The Manchu dynasty was a military power, and they refused to allow the Chinese to migrate into Manchuria and mix with the Manchu population. China was becoming more heavily populated, and Japan also.

This section of land in Manchuria between China and Japan was empty land. It is only in the last ten years that the immense tide of Chinese immigration has been flowing from the north provinces of China to fill up that golden land. There is in Manchuria not only rich agricultural land, but great mineral resources and grand labour opportunities, so that for every one who can exploit the country there are very rich rewards.

In 1895 the Japanese had established themselves through the South-Manchurian Railway, which runs like a backbone through the country. It was necessary to maintain that because Manchuria was necessary to Japan for strategic purposes. She had already made some agreement as to Korea, and finally annexed Korea. The military power pushed forward the same policy, and if they were allowed to carry out their policy to its destined end they would be able in a year or two to annex Manchuria. But they will encounter much open military resistance from China, because it is such a popular resistance that the military adventure promises to be very costly. You might say, from the costliness of this venture it might appear that the military power has gone too far, when the Japanese budget has only been balanced in the last two or three years by loans, and the Government will have to go and ask for a very large loan in June, in the first place to balance the budget, and then to meet the extraordinary strains in Manchuria.

The military party seem to be on a slippery slope that leads to death; but the difficulty is that the military power is in such domination at present and it has inspired such terror for their very existence in the minds of their political opponents that when the task of settlement passes from the political parties to business circles, the business circles themselves will say, "Can we, and dare we take the risk of using our financial power to oppose the policy of the military party?

Now, I cannot bring home for one moment to known members of the military party that striking series of assassinations by which some of the finest leaders in modern Japan have been removed during the arrival of military policy; but you cannot dissociate those assassinations altogether from the military movement in Japan, and one is not surprised—as not only political leaders have been assassinated, but at least one prominent leader of the business world—that to-day, when bankers and business men are called upon to finance the military power, they hesitate to throw their financial power in a sacred way, namely, to secure the throne from the military government.

Therefore you may take it that the government is only bankrupt so far as taxation and revenue are concerned; and therefore it may be assumed to be in a mood to reconstruct the policy which has greatly increased the expenditure. Nevertheless, in these circumstances you find not only opponents of the military school virtually maintaining the financial extra expenses, but very far from using their power to prevent the military party from carrying out their policy.

It is an entire mistake to suppose that when we contemplate the problem of Manchuria situation in its international aspect we are dealing merely with the quarrel between Japan and China. Manchuria is only one problem in Japan itself. Therefore you see that the problem of international diplomacy is not so easy as some would make out. What are the other problems involved? If it were only a Manchurian issue, if it were only an attempt by the younger class of Japanese soldiers to revert to the past in Japan, and to wipe out once more the parliamentary regime, it would have been smashed up. But it is not a local situation, and must have international application. It is more than that. In the last twelve years a new internationalism has arisen, in which the nations are lined more closely together than before.

We have had from the American Secretary of State a reminder as to how the nations are linked together through the Washington Treaty. That Treaty may be a question of controversy, but there are two documents to which the powers are subject. Mr. Stimson suggests that the other ought to be observed. Let me repeat to you the position as presented from Mr. Stimson's end; I do not say he may not have gone too far, but that is an affair for the people of the United States.

Mr. Stimson's contention was this: By the Washington Treaty—no doubt as the result of the existence of the League in Europe—an attempt was made to put the map of the world in the Pacific Ocean on a new foundation. The four powers principally concerned—France, England, Japan and the United States of America—attempted to avert war between themselves, and so guaranteed to one another their island possessions, and by certain clauses dealing with any questions that might arise threatening the possessions in the Pacific Ocean. The second part was the Nine-Power Treaty, in which Japan also had a part, which in a sense provided international surety for China, and provided that the signatories of that Treaty would cooperate with the group in China to help on the revolution. That was signed by both Japan and ourselves. The three powers most concerned, namely, the United States, Japan and England, signed the Treaty on Naval Disarmament, by which, incidentally—and this has special significance, of course, for the Pacific—the United States undertook not to place on the basis of modern fortifications either the Philippine Islands or Guam, and we undertake not to fortify Hong Kong.

There you have a three-fold basis of a new system. It was not a completed structure; it was only a beginning, an experiment in internationalism. The point of Mr. Stimson's doctrine is this; that if Japan, in a fit of impatience with the way China has handled her own problem, violated her obligations under the Nine-Power Treaty, and proceeded to go on violating and ignoring them as a military party, and doing it through their activities in Geneva, then the other powers of the three-power Treaty—the United States and England—might reconsider their attitude to the Disarmament Treaty. Then we may be plunged into a naval war in the Far East. So far as that is concerned, the Japanese policy might only be the first clod of earth taken out of the dam, and that loosening of that stone in the dam might let loose the whole of the eastern war throughout the world.

We have been told by Japanese belligerents themselves that if the united public opinion of the world had taken a firmer stand, and even applied a slight pressure to the railway problem a year ago, we might not have been presented with the Manchurian problem to-day. As a late minister of the Japanese Government said in London, the result of the "wait and see" policy on the part of the powers is that the military have been able to consolidate their position, and they were heading for a war throughout the world. I believe that a pursued and common policy—common to two of the three governments who have most to say in this, namely, England, United States and France—two of these coming together and pursuing a genuine policy, even at this late hour, would secure some modification of Japanese policy, and bring about a situation in the Far East that would more directly lead back to peace in the Far East.

But as we are realists we must face the situation to-day. We must acknowledge that the discussions going on to-day in Geneva have not made the prospect nearer of bringing the military power in Japan to reason. While it may be true that the recommendations of the Lytton

Commission cannot at the moment be made applicable in Manchuria, through Japan's attitude in the face of world opinion—the proposals are based on sound principles, and they can be made operative provided there is a change of party political power in Japan. Time is on the side of the Lytton Report.

If we allow Japan to go along in her proposed line, the conclusion we must inevitably draw from this course is that we must have a more genuine cooperation between the Governments of the English-speaking world. We should contrive to do much to-day which could more easily have been done months ago, and which, if not brought into operation during the next five months, would make us morally responsible for the break-up of the international system founded on the League of Nations. (Loud applause.)

President Drew thanked the speaker for his informing and vital address.

THE NEW GERMANY

Addresses by COUNT VON LUCKNER and PROF. VICTOR LANGE, Ph.D.

Tuesday, November 29, 1932

Lieut.-Colonel George A. Drew, President, introduced the speakers.

Count Von Luckner: I am happy and delighted to see you. I am a sailor, and I am not a great speaker. I am here on a mission of goodwill, to destroy illwill caused by the war, and get closer relations and better understanding. (Hear, hear.) When a boy of thirteen I ran away from home because I had difficulty in passing examinations in school. My father wanted me to become a lieutenant, but my teacher assured me I would become a bum. (Laughter.) Well, that I could not understand. I tried my best to learn, but I could not, so one day I read a book in which I found the dream of my boyhood. It was a book of my hero, of that great pioneer, Buffalo Bill. (Laughter.) In this book I read of the old adventures and the pioneer spirit of this country. I learned much about self-made men, and the great people they were without passing examinations in school, and so I thought, by jove—(laughter) if there be a country which gives me a chance to become a great man without examinations, I go over to America; I want to meet Buffalo Bill. (Laughter.) So I ran away from home on a sailing ship. I could not sail on a German ship, and I had no permit from my parents to go on a ship, and I had no papers. On account of my name I could not risk sailing on a German ship, so I changed my name and assumed the name of Schuyler. That Russian ship was not bound for America, but for Australia. Well, I thought, never mind, the world is round. I could not understand their language on that Russian ship, so I had to take all the dirty work, and when we arrived at Australia I ran away. I started as a kitchen boy in a hotel.

Now, when far away from home I thought of my dear, good mother and my father, and I recalled the promise I had given my father to become a lieutenant. Well, by jove, I managed to become a lieutenant in the army. One day I met the Salvation Army—(laughter); I didn't know what kind of army it was—(laughter)—but never mind, they had lieutenants—(laughter)—and so I thought, by jove, here I have a chance to fulfil the promise to my father, to become a lieutenant. So I joined the Salvation Army as a private. You know the Salvation Army; they are good people—(Hear, hear) they do lots of good, but it took me too long a time to become a lieutenant, and so I left the army. They helped me to get a ship again. They did not want me on the ship, because I was too young, and they put me on a lighthouse (laughter)—as assistant lighthouse keeper. You know it was a very lonely life—all alone on some island; but that lighthouse keeper had a daughter named Eva; she loved me—(laughter)—and I liked her—(laughter)—and that was the reason why I had to leave my lighthouse. (Laughter.)

Well, since the start of my life I have been sailing many years—under the Union Jack, under the Stars and Stripes, the Scandinavian flag, and even the Russian flag. I returned home eight years later. I had made $1,500. I was made a lieutenant in the navy, and I could tell my father, "My dear father, I am here, I have fulfilled my promise, I am a lieutenant in the navy." A year later I got a commission from the Emperor because of my medals for life-saving. I have the most medals for life-saving in my country, and I am proud of that. (Applause.) Two I got from sailors whose life I saved, one in Australia and one in Germany.

When the war broke out my place was at the Battle of Jutland, with more than 500 ships there. They fired 300,000 pounds of steel every ten seconds, and 3,600 torpedos were fired during those battles. It was the spirit of a true nation, but the ships fight as men fight, and we are proud to-day to meet such great masses of fellows with such grand traditions at sea. In 1916 we were in an awful position. The British had tied up everything in a blockade; no ship could get out or in without their control. That was the reason why we could not get any nitre. You know nitre is the most important stuff to make powder with. Nitre comes from Chile, South America. Our nitre was almost finished; we could not get any powder, and you know it is an awful feeling, being at war without any powder. (Laughter.) There was only one possibility, to send out fast cruisers and sink light ships carrying nitre, to make sure of obtaining it. But they could not do it because they had no fueling stations out at sea.

One day I spoke to the Admiral; I said, "If you have no fueling stations, make yourself independent of fuel; turn a sailing ship into a raider; all you need is wind, and you realize that wind is neutral. (Laughter.) So I got command of an old sailing ship, a full-rigged ship. I selected the longest night. I had only two allies; one was the pitch dark night which would shield me against the inquisitive eyes of the British, and I wanted a long dark night, so I selected the longest night of the year, the 21st of December. And the other ally I had was a hurricane. You know what a hurricane will do for a ship. The hurricane filled my sails and gave me the speed to run through that passage, no matter whether crowded with cruisers or dreadnaughts, on the 21st of December. The temperature was falling, the southwest wind was setting in, and in the hurricane I broke through. I was carrying 36,864 square feet of sail. We were through to the south of Ireland on December 25th, in the morning at 8:30, and the ship was stopped by the

British cruiser "Adventure". I was examined by the British. I had no arms to defend my ship. I was in disguise as a Norwegian skipper; I had a beard. (Laughter.) I had no arms, and wrong papers, but a clear conscience. (Laughter.) You don't know what it means to raid with a clear conscience, but having wrong papers. (Laughter.) It would take a long time to tell my experience with a gramophone; I had it play, "It's a long, long way to Tipperary"—to raid with a clear conscience. (Laughter.) It would take a long time to tell of the various examinations I had to pass, and the doctor visited me five months ago in New York, and he is my closest friend to-day. I would not have been fooled if I had been in his position, but he could not know a sailing vessel becoming a raiding vessel. But the sailors I had were regular fellows—fellows that could raid with clear consciences. (Laughter.)

My mission was to destroy ships carrying nitre, knowing that every thousand pounds of nitre I destroyed I saved 10,000 lives of my countrymen. But after my sailing as a raider I did not feel like a warrior; I felt like a sailor. The war had all its propaganda, but it could not convince me of a sailor being my enemy. Well, I have been sailing under those flags, and sailors are ever ready to help each other; nobody on the shore is able to help us, only the sailor helps his fellow sailor, and we don't ask what nation he belongs to if he is in distress. When I was out, I have never had a closer contact with my good mother; I felt here prayers; and the one human being that I consider truly international is the mother, no matter what country she belongs to. The tongue we talk is the mother-tongue; the country we were born in is the mother-country; we were brought up by our parents to love our nation; we fought for our country, with all its propaganda, and we had to fight for the country, and a man will fight for his family if it is in danger, for he loves his family, and the sailor loves his country, and the man he fights he will never hate, because love is better than hate. What makes the mother great on this earth is her mother-love, and the man who loves is greater than the man who hates. (Applause.)

I have completed my mission. I have destroyed 100,000 tons of shipping with that old sailing ship that was built in 1864—(laughter)—with 9" cannon balls of 1200 range. I had 600 prisoners through the war, including 34 dogs and 144 cats. (Laughter.) I broke through the British blockade with a clear conscience, knowing that no father, no good mother, no wife, no child, had ever lost a tear through my warfare. I know that every sailor of whatever nation would have acted the same as I did. (Loud applause.)

PRESIDENT DREW: I shall now call upon a very brilliant young German, Dr. Lange, who left Germany a few months ago to join the University of Toronto, who will speak on *The New Germany.*

PROF. LANGE was received with applause, and said: A new generation, a new mentality, a new regard for the world within and without has arisen in Germany after the revolution of 1918. And if you have asked me to speak to-day about that new Germany it must be not only an explanation of recent events but it must amount, I believe and I fear, to nothing less than a self-defence, for no country in Europe, no country in the world, presents to-day such irritating, terrifying and puzzling aspects as Germany. If Germany has always been a country with a mentality too intricate, too complex, too unintelligible to be pressed into one spiritual formula, this incalculability has grown during the last months to a degree which is almost unbelievable. No wonder that abroad, where public opinion rests more or less exclusively on the scarce and not always complete information of newspapers and journals—no wonder that abroad one feels inclined somewhat angrily to put aside all those puzzling German problems until that country presents again a clear and distinct political face. And yet, it seems to me, those very last months have crystallized certain tendencies which, if they continue, will establish a great meaning and significance to the movements which are at work at present.

If those of you who visited Germany ten years ago had at that time felt the amazing intensity among the German workmen or among the impoverished middle class, among the intellectuals or among the officials of the country, a conviction that the revolution of 1918 had given us a new and more or less permanent form of political life, a democracy, a republic, a strong social movement and all those surprising but sincere forms of a new cultural belief; in brief, if they felt that a socialistic, pacifist, internationalist but friendly Germany had grown, and if the following eight years seemed to give them every right to believe that such a form of life had actually penetrated the present German generation—they began to feel a little doubtful about the accuracy of their own judgments when, after September, 1930, they heard of dictatorship, of fascicism and of growing militaristic tendencies in Germany.

Let me take you back to those years after the war, years of distress and poverty, of utter despair and hopelessness for almost every German; the time of the inflation of German currency, when a loaf of bread cost nearly of billion marks, and when the occupation of German territory by French troops caused a complete breakdown of our industry. Let me take you back to the time when the hatred of a large section of the people against their own government, which would and could do nothing but fulfill the demands of foreign creditors and foreign politicians, when that hatred led to the assassination of a great German statesman; Walther Rathenan. Let me remind you of the years in which Gustav Stresemann, with his supreme realistic sense for political cooperation, achieved at least in 1925, at Locarno the recognition of Germany as an equal partner in the European council, and when, at last, in 1926, Germany entered the League of Nations as a permanent member. Let me remind you of those years because they bear in themselves the germ of the sudden and amazing swing to a new but only apparently opposite tendency since September, 1930. At that time elections for a new Reichstag brought the surprising evidence of a growing concentration of the young and proletarian voters around Adolph Hitler. Hitler had attempted a *coup d'état* in 1923, had failed, had been in prison and after his release set to work again for a formation of a new party: the National-socialists. The programme which he published showed a revolutionary and violently anti-parliamentary tendency. His party, small in the beginning, grew rapidly; for the keynote of his intention was radical change of the present unsatisfactory conditions. Hitler was an Austrian, but so close are the cultural aims of Germany and Austria that nobody objected to Hitler as a foreigner interfering with our own politics! Millions of unemployed and thousands of students, professors and business people joined the Nazi movement; and when he actually reached a stage where he could act as a politician with a mandate from several millions of voters, he endangered the working of the political machinery so decisively that, in 1930, Reichs chancellor Brüning had to resort to direct methods and, although never without or against the representative body, the Reichstag, he had to deal with the most vital matters by emergency decree: i.e. Article 48 of the German Constitution provides the possibility for the President of the Reich to settle immediate political or economic questions without previously consulting the Reichstag. The opposition of Hitler to such dictatorial measures from a system against which he fought with all his vigor, was violent: elections for the Prussian diet and the presidential elections in 1932 showed phenomenal gains for his party. But they gave ample evidence of the growth not only of nationalist but also of revolutionary feelings.

At about the same time the Brüning cabinet, in its endeavour to solve the critical unemployment situation, evolved plans for the settlement of thousands of unemployed on the almost bankrupt estates of the old Prussian landowners, or Junkers. Von Hindenburg, the eighty-five year old president, who enjoys unrivalled prestige and who is undoubtedly the most amazing, the most venerable figure in present day European politics, felt that he could no longer ignore the growing demands of certain nationalistic groups. Although Brüning had just received from the Reichstag a vote of confidence, the president did not see himself in a position to give him full support for his negotiations at the forthcoming conference at Lausanne. Brüning and his cabinet resigned and Franz von Papen was appointed chancellor, a man, who from the very beginning met with the instantaneous opposition of all parties. His cabinet of "national concentration" issued a manifesto which declared that in "these critical times the country needs a government independent of political parties; but such a government needs the trustful cooperation with the Riechstag in order to proceed with the restoration of Germany by way of regular legislation".

And here begin for the foreigner the difficulties for an understanding of the situation. What does it mean: "a government independent of political parties which needs the cooperation of the Reichstag"? What does it mean, "the restoration of Germany"?

As you will remember, Hitler, on August 13th, was invited to cooperate with the von Papen cabinet. He refused to participate unless the chancellorship and the fullest responsibility would be given to him. In the course of a few weeks the Reichstag was dissolved and the elections of November 6th again brought no substantial change in the constellation of the political parties, so that after the formal resignation of von Papen and after several attempts to form a coalition cabinet have failed, there is, at present, apparently no other way out of the difficulties than a new "appointed" presidential cabinet which has the backing not of the popular representation, but of the Reichspresident and that fatal but indispensable article 48 of the constitution.

The situation which I have outlined very briefly and insufficiently is puzzling enough, and I know that the questions which you would ask me might be these: How is it that a cabinet of presidential appointments, the members of which are not even members of the Reichstag, can govern a country so entirely against the will of a large, perhaps the largest, part of the nation, against the strongest party in the Reichstag—and what has that cabinet or that form of government achieved to justify its existence? But you will, perhaps, with the greatest astonishment ask me: How is that the liberal, democratic Germany of 1920 could suddenly turn towards a fundamentally different form of political existence? These questions are difficult to answer. They are not mathematical problems with a possible but necessary solution, nor are they simple historical facts which need only a little light to appear clearly; but you can only understand these problems if you attempt to understand the complex and startling German mentality.

It is difficult to give a foreigner an adequate picture of the violence and intensity of political strife in Germany. A nation, disunited within, discontented, under the heaviest economic pressure, a pressure infinitely, incomparably more severe than that of this country; through fifteen years restless and disappointed—what does it want? *Peace and living!* Between five and six million men out of work, and if you consider that not only those individuals but their families depend on the dole, you realize that nearly every fourth German lives to-day on public support! The von Papen cabinet has done a great deal for the alleviation of unemployment or, to state it more accurately, for the rehabilitation of business. Its programme has several essential parts: First, employers are to receive a loan in the form of promisary notes equivalent in value to 40% of their tax on turnover, industrial property and land, industrial profits and transport due from October 1st, 1932 to September 30th, 1933. These notes will be accepted in payment of taxes other than income tax in the financial years 1934-38. Their total value is estimated at about 350 million dollars and they are to bear 4% interest. The second part of the programme provides a bonus to employers who take on more workers. And, thirdly, twelve and a half million dollars are to be made available for building and other housing repairs.

But let us from unemployment turn to the small struggling business man in the country—let us turn to the millions of university students. There is no hope, not the slightest, for any of them being appointed as teachers or as lawyers. For more than ten years our higher schools are supplied with teachers—and yet thousands of passionate, hard-working students go through their terms, starve themselves through their terms—hopeless, depressed, discontented, on often less than $25 a month, and yet with a burning intensity. Everywhere literary activities mirror the political division so that almost every writer of novels or poetry can be classified according to his political rather than his artistic creed. And instead of having one association of ex-soldiers we have the steel-helmet group with its conservative, nationalistic tendency, and the republican *Reichbanner* which will defend the state for which it fought during and after the war. Everywhere a desire for activity, for action, political, religious—activity against something—against what—and here is the central question for anyone who wants to understand that new Germany of which I have spoken to you—against what?

Two slogans—precise and yet misleading if you do not understand the position of those who utter them—two slogans you will always hear in a discussion between two hostile German politicians. "Germany awake" "Against the system"! the cry of Hitler's friends, and "Against the reaction" you will hear from the Left from the communists and socialists.

But those two slogans are by no means merely political catchwords; they embody two philosophies of life, and if you survey the confusion among the German political parties you will always have to remember that each of those fifty political groups that applied for a place in the ballot in the last election had its own infallible panacea and its own inflexible and uncompromising idea of how the world ought to be organized.

Let us look at those parties. There were twenty-nine on the last ballot and some fifteen are now represented in the Reichstag, parties from 200 to two representatives; the strongest of them all being that of Adolf Hitler, the National-Socialist German Workman's Party or, in short Nazis. An amazing movement, undoubtedly, which you have to trace back, if you want to understand it, to the time of the inflation with its political and commercial outrageousness, with its graft and bribery, with its profiteers and *nouveau riches* against whom the violent hatred of all those young men turned, for whom the war meant not more than a dim recollection, but the years afterwards, all the bitterness and despair in the world, the years from 1920-25 with their socialistic governments, with their policy of fufillment, with their ever increasing economic difficulties.

Hitler, whose extraordinary oratorical gifts organized in no time one of the most surprising movements in our history, gathered all dissatisfaction with the prevailing "system", not only with its present conditions, under the black *swastika* of his red and white flag. I remember a meeting of the Nazis in the Berlin Untergarten. 250,000 people had gathered, thousands of brown shirts listening to the extraordinary vigor of Hitler's speech. Violently cheering, raising their hands to greet the leader. The meeting dissolved into small groups of perhaps a hundred people and you could see them marching through the Berlin streets, stopping at street corners and enthusiastically, well disciplined, shouting like a chorus their "Germany awake!" Shouting, until with a shrill, sharp warning whistle a police car drove along and in no time chased them away. And yet Hitler has not, until very recently been able to declare his unconditioned readiness to cooperate with the other parties. He has failed to prove his statesmanship and leadership. But thirteen million people declared themselves at the last election for a radical change in governmental practice, thirteen million people have joined that crusade for Hitler's National-socialism, for it cannot be called a party any more—its lack of precise political plans, its unwillingness to limit its radical demands will decrease its actual political influence. But a crusade, a creed it is. One hundred and twenty socialists, 100 communists, nearly 70 members of the Catholic centre party and some fifty Nationalists stand against it in the Reichstag. The socialists, still a strong block of workmen and bourgeois elements, 100 communists, surely as convinced of their logical victory, if not more so than the Nationalists, as radical and as sincere, as desperate and determined, as the followers of Hitler. Those 70 members of the Centre Party, still, in their readiness for a coalition with left or right, are the key to any attempt to continue the parliamentary mode of government which has been, during the last 15 years, the aim of every coalition cabinet.

But, gentlemen, you will ask how can a cabinet, whereever it may come from, how can it ignore the popular representation, how can it disregard the constellation of the parties in the Reichstag? The theory underlying the present movement is that Gemany has had enough of party politics. The idea of the party state has in Germany proved to be wrong or, at least, in a state with, at present, fifteen active parties, most highly dangerous and unpracticable. A government above those fifteen parties, not subject to party pulling and hauling, is necessary. The idea of the neutral state, the authoritative state, not the party state, is the theoretical foundation on which the recent developments in Germany have been based. It is, as I said before, characteristic of the Germans that they must have a philosophical basis for their actions; but the shortcomings of parliamentary government in Germany have, no doubt, supplied practical reasons as well for a new political tendency.

A new political tendency there is, and if I have succeeded in convincing you that this new, conservative Germany has nothing terrifying, nothing fearful, nothing dangerously militaristic about herself, this short account of the present situation will not have been in vain.

Do not believe those who threaten you with the immediate return of a monarchy in Germany (the monarchy might come, not the last Kaiser will return, but for the German temperament a monarchist constitution might prove to be the most adequate), but our problems are at present too urgent to allow us to think of the roof of our house before the foundations have proved to be solid enough. Do not believe those who, in vague terms, speak of a dictatorship in Germany or, in even less careful language of the erection of a bolshevist rule.

But do believe and do understand what it means if I say that there is a strong conservative and national movement growing and growing, and that whatever the next few weeks will bring they will have to reveal the underlying conservative forces. I am not using the terms liberal or conservative in any relation to existing party conditions, merely as indicating two views of life. I do not mean to say that, as it might happen in England or in America, a natural reaction against the liberal forces in the state will bring the conservative elements into power again. It is something infinitely more radical, more profound, more complete. It is, in brief the return to—metaphysically speaking—the idea of mutual ties and order, an opposition to the liberal tendencies of the French Revolution and to the half digested, vague Socialism of the early twentieth century.

What happens in Germany at present is far from being a "reaction" in the common usage of the political term. In its most general aspect the political situation tends towards a consolidation of values and activities. The concentration of the parties shows encouraging progress with every election. It will never amount, I am afraid, to a reduction of those fifteen parties which we have at present to the two or three or four in England. The German politician is an eminently theoritical being. You must, therefore, never judge Germany from without, from your own different point of view, but try to grasp the intrinsic characteristics and necessities of her own political life.

Hindenburg and Hitler are at present the great factors of power and decision in Germany. You will say that Hitler has twice missed his chance—you will object that Hindenburg's venerable age might take him away at any moment from the political life. But whatever you say, this you will be told by every German, young or old, that our life has taken a new turn since those two men appeared on the historical scene. However small Hitler's actual political influence may be, or how small his qualities as a leader may be, his historical significance cannot be questioned. He aroused the consciousness of a new conservative attitude, not only among the bourgeoisie but particularly among groups of young people who had seen during the past fifteen years the futile attempts of helpless liberal coalitions to establish political and cultural stability. Hitler, indeed, awakened millions of uncertain voters to the fact that their ballot, given to a national party would not be lost altogether. Hitler's political importance, seems to me, is dangerously overrated in foreign countries; but his victory in 1930 started, as a cultural even more than a political awakening, that process of the liquidation of the Weimar liberalism and the defeatist attitude, which, in the terminology of the German Nationalists, means nothing less than the beginning of a "Conservative German Revolution".

You are perhaps inclined, gentlemen, over here to attach a certain meaning of old fashioned pre-war spirit to the repeated assurance of national tendencies. What does this *new* nationalism mean? We have outgrown the years and evils of pre-war mentality. We have cast aside all jingoistic and bellicose patriotism. But we have, in short, tried to reach during those last years an assimilation of the after-war socialism to the necessities of a specific German national temperament.

Hitler's programme, incomplete and contradictory as it may be, is nothing but the temperamental fusion of the social experiences after the war with our German mentality. Political discussions, therefore, assume, in Germany, inevitably the form of a discussion of broad cultural issues. Many a young German, many of my own friends, whether their tendencies are radical towards right or left, are now turning away from political activities altogether and confine or, if you like broaden, themselves to the more general questions of our civilization. Our internal as well as our foreign policy suffer from this fatal apotheosis of the "idea". A new constitution, embodying the conservative tendencies of the last 20 years will be presented to the Reichstag as soon as possible, a reform of the internal relations between the lands and the Reich will clearly outline the new federal tendencies. But whatever the discussion within may be, it is clear that any German government, whatever its political conviction may be, will have to convey to the world that peace and cooperation are the two principles of our international aims. The temporary withdrawal of Germany from the disarmament conference, after years of patient but profoundly disappointing discussions at Geneva, meant nothing else but an appeal to the world to clearly indicate whether they want to go towards destruction and a repetition of 1914 or towards peace. There is no truth in the repeated newspaper assurance of Germany's will to rearm. Germany asks of the world, not only equality and political recognition—but what we young people want is something more difficult to give and something less easy to ask for—understanding.

One must misunderstand us if one applies the principles of other national and political forms to our own—our history is different from yours, gentlemen, our country has always been the battlefield of ideas and enthusiastic theories rather than of practical, straightforward decisions. I do not need to remind you of that sign post at a cross road: the one arm indicating the way to heaven, the other to a lecture on heaven—all Germans will take the way to the lecture on heaven!

Political fight is with us a fight between philosophies of life—it is as violent and as irreconcilable as you will never be able to believe. We need, and only such a policy has creative strength, we need in Germany a political creed broad enough to unite us within and clear enough to be the foundation of a cooperation with the world outside. But we cannot cooperate, gentlemen, we cannot give our share to the common end, we young people of a new Germany, if we feel that we are isolated, that we are not understood, that we are measured with the eyes of a prewar generation. I have attempted, briefly and insufficiently, I am afraid, but with all the sincerity I have, to explain to you the intricate and complex forces which guide us to-day, but it depends on you now, gentlemen, on the public opinion of your country and the world, to understand the tempermental difficulties within us, difficulties against which we have to fight ourselves; it depends on you to decide whether there are not noble efforts behind our desperate struggle, and to accept the ready and willing hands of my young Germany for our common task.

The President voiced the thanks of the Club to the speakers for their interesting addresses.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION IN WISCONSIN

AN ADDRESS BY PROF. HAROLD M. GROVES
Tuesday, December 6, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

PROFESSOR GROVES: I am very happy to be your guest on this occasion. In Wisconsin we have used your province as an example many times. We have been seeking to inaugurate a public power program which will give our people the benefit of cheap electricity. We should like our electricity to be cheap enough so that it can be used more freely. We are seeking to make this electricity available to thousands of farmers who are still without it. When we have been confronted with difficulties in the realization of this programme we have said, "Ontario has done it, why can't we?"

But I am here to talk on unemployment legislation in Wisconsin.

A great many people, I think, have come to the conclusion during this depression that much of their economic thinking has to be revised. For example, the idea was once prevalent that any man anywhere could get a job if he would. We know now that this isn't true. It is not true that from one-sixth to one-fourh of our people are inherently lazy. Opportunity which was once a drug on the market has become a prized privilege.

So, also, we once had the idea that every man had the privilege of labouring as much as he liked. "Six days shalt thou labour", says the Good Book, and the more hours the better. We know now that leisure as well as wealth is badly distributed, and that a man who works twelve hours a day six days a week may be a social menace.

We used to think that every man was entitled to the fruits of his labour and that he should be ashamed to take a dole. We know now that the fruits of a man's labour are very obscure, and whether or not a payment constitutes a dole depends to a considerable degree upon the rules of the game.

We used to say that every man should take care of himself and provide for his own rainy day. We know now that many people cannot save and that if they could, it might profit them little to do so, when banks and other institutions for saving are failing every day. We know also that business wants people to spend at all times and uses all the pressure it can to get them to do so.

Much has been said about the wastes of our modern economic system. It now seems quite clear that the outstanding waste of all is the waste of unemployment. Figures submitted by the American Federation of Labour some months ago in its monthly service of business showed that workers' incomes in 1931 were $11,000,000,000 below what they received in 1929. The national loss from unemployment includes not only the wealth which eight to twelve million men might have procured had they had the opportunity. It includes, in addition, the loss to industry and agriculture resulting from the collapse of wage earners' buying power. It includes the deterioration of our human resources. The last mentioned of these losses will be felt for a long time to come. We are told that over 60,000,000 American citizens are now living below minimum health standards. Among the school children of Pennsylvania, according to the Survey of Business, 29% are under-nourished. The number of tuberculosis patients had nearly doubled since 1929, and practically all diseases showed definitely increasing trends. The chief defense of capitalism has been its claim to efficiency. Unless it tackles the problem of unemployment, it must, indeed, look to its laurels.

Many are of the opinion that unemployment is a problem only during depressions. There is abundant evidence to prove that this view is incorrect. Irregularities of employment are characteristic of even our most prosperous years. Loss of time and wages caused by these chronic irregularities are quite as serious over a decade as the "depressional" unemployment which is now attracting so much attention. There is also "technological unemployment", a term that is used to describe the enforced idleness which follows the displacement of men by machinery. This kind of unemployment is quite as characteristic of good times as of bad. Displacement of men by machinery is nothing new, but it has been going on at a pace seldom, if ever, before witnessed. Displaced men are reabsorbed by industry only after a painful period of readjustment, and some of them, in all probability, are never reabsorbed at all.

Doctor Wesley C. Mitchell, in one of his studies recently published in a book entitled *Recent Economic Changes,* came to the conclusion that "the supply of new jobs has not been equal to the new workers plus the old workers displaced. Hence, there has been an increased unemployment between 1920 and 1927 which exceeds 600,000 people". More recently a group of economists and engineers estimated that were we to return to the 1929 level of production, not more than half of the unemployed could be given work.

The full human tragedy of unemployment is difficult for a single human mind to grasp. In the State of Wisconsin alone (and our state is not exceptional), there are now close to 85,000 families receiving charity. Assembled into one group this would make a breadline stretching across the state along its southern border — a fairly good day's drive. This is not the breadline of the United States, but only of one not highly industrialized state.

At least ten countries now have some sort of unemployment insurance covering 45,000,000 workers. Most of these countries are very much poorer than the United States; were harder hit by the war, and are now more burdened with taxes. These nations have placed the conservation of their human resources first, and much credit is due them for it.

Nevertheless, European models of unemployment insurance need not necessarily fit the requirements of American states. Labour legislation in the United States is the province of the states, and not the national government. It may well be doubted if a single state can afford to inaugurate as costly a system as the European ones. Moreover, the European system makes a fatalistic approach to the problem. They assume that unemployment is a relief problem; that nothing can be done to prevent unemployment. Because of this fatalistic philosophy, European systems have required contributions from employers not according to the amount of their *unemployment,* but according to the amount of the *employment* they are able to give. The employer who gives full employment pays twice as much as one who gives half employment, other things being equal. All contributions are pooled so that no one has any responsibility for conserving the funds. Nor is there any cost accounting between industries. An industry with twice as much unemployment as another will contribute less rather than more to the maintenance of the employees engaged in the industry.

In an attempt to meet the criticisms of European insurance laws, and to make a constructive step toward reducing the bad effects of unemployment, the Wisconsin unemployment compensation law was devised and passed.

The Wisconsin act provides a period until July 1, 1933, in which employers may set up voluntary systems of unemployment reserves. These voluntary systems must meet certain standards imposed by the law; in addition they must be approved by the Industrial Commission as being at least as favorable to the employee as the provisions of the law. If 175,000 employees, roughly somewhat more than half of those eligible to come under the Act, are covered by voluntary systems before July 1, no other employers will be compelled to set up unemployment reserves. If the number covered is less than the prescribed quota, the compulsory features of the Act go into effect. Before proceeding further, it should be stated that the proviso just described was supported by the friends of the Act because employers in the state alleged that they were on the point of adopting unemployment reserve systems voluntarily and should not be hampered by legislation. Most of the supporters of the Act felt that were employers covering more than half the employees of the state to launch unemployment compensation systems, these same employers would be willing to endorse legislation compelling their competitors to meet the standards they were setting.

If by July 1, 1933, an insufficient number of employers have set up voluntary systems, the law provides that each employer who has not established a fund of his own must either do so in a manner approved by the Commission or pay not more than two per cent of his payroll to a state fund where it is to be deposited to his account. The employer's reserve may be used to pay unemployment benefits to his employees when he is unable to give them at least half-time employment. Each company's liability is limited to the amount of its account, and no employer has any liability for employees other than his own. Benefits are limited to fifty per cent of wages, with a ten dollar per week maximum. They are payable for a period not to exceed ten weeks. The duration of benefits is made to vary with the period of employment previous to the lay-off.

If an employer gives steady work, there will be no drain upon his reserve funds for benefit payments; reserve funds will then accumulate. Provision is made for a reduction in the rate of contributions when the reserve amounts to $55 per employee and for a discontinuance of the contribution when the reserve reaches $75 per employee. Successful efforts to give steady work are thus directly rewarded. Since all employees will not be out of work at once, the reserve funds should prove adequate to pay the prescribed benefits.

We heard much, a few months ago, against the dole on the ground that it is demoralizing; it was said that people should be given work and not hand-outs. We hear less of this talk to-day because we have been forced to dole out shamelessly millions upon millions of dollars in order to prevent wholesale destitution and its dangerous consequences. But the early objection to the dole was based on a sound intuition. It *is* better to give people jobs, if it can be done, than to give them money without work. The Wisconsin law provides that any unit of government may give work to an unemployed worker upon some public project and utilize toward paying him wages the benefits he would otherwise have received from his employer. If there is no work for the unemployed workman, he may make use of his time by attending vocational school, and he is given an inducement of slightly increased benefits to do acceptable work in such a school.

The proponents of this legislation have no idea that it is a panacea. They do think that it is a conservative step in the right direction, and that it is grounded on principles which are fundamentally sound. Some of these principles are as follows:

1. The regular employee who has made an investment of time and energy in a business is entitled to some regularity of income as well as the stockholder and bondholder. During this depression many employees who have given

the greater part of their lives to an industry have been dismissed without notice and without compensation. The least an industry may be expected to do for its employees is to give them a dismissal wage in proportion to their term of employment. This is substantially what the Wisconsin law requires, except that the dismissal wage need not be paid when the dismissed employee readily finds new employment.

Reserves in industry and business are not new. They have been used to give the stockholder and bondholder a fairly constant income during much of this depression, even though business was making no earnings. There is no reason in the nature of things why idle capital should receive a secure income and idle workmen not. Nor is there any reason why the reserve idea cannot be applied to give some security to the factor in industry which needs it most, that is, labour. (Hear, hear.)

2. Unemployment should be regarded as one of the costs of doing business and necessary irregularity of production should enter into the price of goods. We have long since given our approval to the idea that industrial accidents are one of the costs of doing business and should be paid for by the purchasers of goods. If one pays a thousand dollars for an automobile, a few dollars of that sum go to take care of those few who are necessarily injured in making cars. Similarly, when one buys a suit of clothes, he should expect to pay a small amount to secure a steady income to the employees necessary to make the suit.

3. It is unfair to the general taxpayer for industry to profit by the labour of its employees during good times and to pay them so irregularly and inadequately that these employees are thrown upon the support of the taxpayers when times are bad. Why should home owners and, in many cases, farmers be charged with the maintenance of men brought to a city and kept there largely for the benefit of an industry? Sooner or later the public is

going to demand that each employer take care of his own men during a depression and this Act simply sets up the machinery which will enable him to do so.

Take, for example, the case of Henry Ford. During much of this depression half, or more than half, of the employees formerly employed by the Ford Motor Company have been out of work. Several thousand men are employed to keep the machinery in first-class condition—to keep it warm and dry and free from rust and dirt. While all this elaborate care is being taken of machines, thousands of men and their families are allowed to shift for themselves in an almost jobless city. This City of Detroit has been called the Silent Partner of Henry Ford. It assumes the task of doing for Ford's men what the company does for his machinery. During one year alone it spent about $8,000,000, keeping Ford's men in condition so that when Ford gives the signal these men would be fit and ready. The Ford Motor Company is located outside the City of Detroit and pays no taxes to the city. During 1931, Edsel Ford contributed $125,000 to the community chest. This was less than one-quarter of one per cent of the $55,000,000 profits which the company gathered in 1930 and less than two per cent of the cost of caring for the unemployed Ford families. The Ford Motor Company is only an extreme case of what is happening to-day throughout all industry.

The employer is not asked to pay the entire cost of unemployment nor to pay the cost of any other employer's unemployment. Responsibility is simply and clearly defined. The employer may reasonably be expected to take some responsibility for his employees more or less in proportion to the time they have been with him. No other system of unemployment compensation that I know of confines the employer's responsibility to his own plant. It is not the employer's job to pay a special tax to take care of some other employer's men or of an excess labour supply.

The present amount of unemployment is unnecessary and a considerable portion of it could be prevented. If management had given the same kind of attention to the elimination of unemployment that it has given to the development of industrial technique, there would be far less unemployment today. No less an authority than the United States Chamber of Commerce states that "the regularization of employment is essentially a problem for the principal executive officers of a company". And it adds that an unemployment benefit system can afford a strong incentive to employers to give steady work. We know how effective the "safety engineer" has been in preventing accidents which it had been alleged could not be prevented. The reserves Act will give the "stabilization engineer" his chance.

The Wisconsin law has been criticized because it does not require contributions from employees as well as employers.

In the first place it is not good social policy to force compulsory saving by law upon a class of people many of whom should in the social interest spend every penny of their incomes upon food and shelter for their families and education for their children. The average earnings per year among workmen in this state is probably below $1,200 per year. No study by the Federal Department of Labour of family budgets necessary for decent living has arrived at a total lower than $1,600 a year.

Under no system of benefits contemplated will the employee be fully compensated for his loss during unemployment. The workman will still have the brunt of the burden to bear. The public, too, will still have a relief problem which will constitute its share of the burden.

Employers are in a position to do more than any other group to prevent unemployment. There are many who say that unemployment cannot be prevented. The British have taken this fatalistic attitude, and are giving their attention to the relief of unemployment. Unemployment is a human institution and was not placed on this earth as a curse from God. If it is a human institution, it should be subject to prevention by other human institutions. Unemployment relief in any form amounts to an admission of defeat in our effort to solve this problem.

"The chief danger of the British contributory system", says Sir William Beveridge, "lies not so much in the risk of demoralizing recipients of relief so that they do not look for work, as in the risk of demoralizing governments, employers, and trade unions, so that they take less thought for the prevention of unemployment."

The British Trades Union Congress has taken the position that "unemployment insurance" should be financed by the state and paid for by a tax upon wages, salaries, and profits. All employees, in whatever industry, should be supported from this fund if they are unable to find work, and the government should support them "from the cradle to the grave". This is the logical end of the British system built, as it is, upon the idea of relief. A system aimed at prevention, and more limited in scope, seems eminently worth trying first.

There are many ways in which seasonal unemployment can be prevented, as a number of progressive employers in the United States have amply demonstrated. Technological unemployment could be greatly reduced by retraining and vocational guidance. Cyclical unemployment may be conceded to be beyond the employers of any one state. But if all the employers of the country were to join in an attempt to solve even this difficult problem, only the most confirmed pessimist would say that they could do nothing.

Unemployment which cannot be prevented is a business cost and should be borne like other business costs, by the consumers of goods.

The contributory system is much more difficult to administer than a non-contributory system. Unless the employee's contribution is to be regarded as a tax for relief, a separate account should be kept for each employee. When the employee leaves a company, his account, with or without the contribution of his employer, should go with him. This involves much complicated machinery of adminstration.

Almost every reason urged to support a contributory system of "unemployment insurance" could be urged to support a contributory system of paying for industrial accidents. It is generally conceded that we made no mistake when we placed the entire cost of workmen's compensation upon industry, even though European countries had followed another system. We will make no mistake if we treat unemployment in the same way.

It has been said that the Wisconsin Act is not unemployment insurance at all. Strictly speaking, this is true. Legislation built on the insurance principle starts with the employee and makes his contribution, or one made for him, the basis for insuring him against the hazard of unemployment. This legislation treats unemployment as a cost like depreciation and insists that this cost be included among the overhead expenses of industry.

No insurance company that I know anything about has ever concluded that the principles of insurance were applicable to unemployment. Unless every employer and employee is to be given the same rate, some one must predict the risk of unemployment in advance. And it is an extremely difficult thing to predict. It is possible, of course, to socialize the maintenance of the unemployed by creating a huge fund from which each unemployed workman might draw as a matter of right.

There is much to be said for a national system of relief financed through contributions based on ability to pay, as the British Labour Party has advocated. It is rather too ambitious a program for a single state. And it should be combined at least with a system which fixes responsibility and encourages prevention.

The Wisconsin law has been criticized on the ground that it offers nothing to the individual who is unattached to any industry and who is unable to become attached. The proponents of the Wisconsin law answer that insofar as the unattached are unemployables they must be taken care of in some other way. Insofar as they represent surplus labour, they should be reabsorbed through a reduction of hours of labour.

These people have their claim not upon industry, but upon society. Perhaps eventually we shall regard them as entitled to more than the hand-out of the relief agencies. If so, benefits for this group should be financed by a general tax in proportion to ability to pay.

It may be argued that the reserve provision in the Wisconsin law and the benefits prescribed by it would be insufficient during depressions. This is probably true, though the benefits would help considerably to tide the worker over these periods. It is important, also, to note that employees would receive benefits as a matter of right and not of charity. As we said before, unemployment is not confined to depressions. Over a period of a decade seasonal unemployment is quite as important as depressional unemployment. The reserves would help piece out the year for an employee who is under-employed. Technological unemployment is important too. It is caused by the substitution of machinery for men. In case of technological unemployment, the dismissal wage and the opportunity to attend vocational school with pay would be a godsend to many a luckless workman.

It has been said that this is an unpropitious time to start a proposition of this kind; that it would be better to wait until prosperity returns. It is true that unemployment reserve legislation looks to the future and is not for this depression. On the other hand, when prosperity has returned people's attention will no longer be focused on the problem of unemployment. Moreover, a reserve system is most properly begun at the *beginning* of recovery. This is the time when employers are taking on new men and is the time when they should begin building their reserves. While we are at the bottom of the trough of depression the time undoubtedly is unsuitable, but reserve systems should be designed and held in readiness so that when things begin to pick up they can be put in force.

It is also said that one state is too small a unit to enact legislation of this sort. There is truth in this criticism. Yet it is also true that states alone in the United States are permitted to enact labor legislation of this kind. Sound legislation may be expected to spread to other states. Already, the Interstate Commission on Unemployment has recommended legislation following the pattern of the Wisconsin Act. The Commission grew out of a conference called by Governor Roosevelt in New York, and represented Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, as well as New York. Governor (and President-elect) Roosevelt has personally endorsed the Commission's report. More recently the American Federation of Labour has endorsed unemployment insurance.

The human wastage caused by unemployment is second only to that caused by war. We need some war-time courage in facing this problem. Charity is no solution of the unemployment problem. It is a necessary drug for a sick patient. But what we need most is some preventive medicine. We need a radical change in the machinery with which we attempt to cope with unemployment. We need a compulsory unemployment compensation system.

Consider the effects of unsteady employment upon the life of a city. There are communities in this state where the important industries have been both able and willing to make what amount to long time contracts with their men. The men have been given the feeling that they have been taken on "for better or for worse," and that their employers will see them through. These people buy homes in the community; their children attend steadily the community school; the family buys steadily from the community merchant. The family has become a self-respecting and public-spirited part of the community. When a depression comes the community weathers through relatively well. The employer has so managed his business and his finances that his men receive and expect to receive at least a large part of their usual income.

Contrast this with a community in which the important industries hire and fire as their immediate contracts seem to require. People are constantly coming and going in such a city. Very few are sufficiently settled to acquire property and a community spirit. The children are in and out of school. Retail trade is good when things are booming in the big factories. It is bad when men are being laid off. A depression hits such a town like a cyclone. Huge numbers of people must be cared for by the charity agencies. The crime problem becomes acute. People at first unemployed drift into vicious habits and join the class of the unemployables.

Unemployment bears down upon the worker in many ways, the most obvious of which is to rob him of his wages. Curiously enough—and unfortunately—the average worker does not reckon his pay in terms of what he gets during a year or over a period of years. He reckons the pay by what he gets for an hour's work. Thus carpenters are supposed to be well paid; yet I know of one city in the State of Wisconsin where in 1929 carpenters, though paid $1.10 an hour, earned less on the average than $1,100 a year. Labour in the automobile industry—especially at Ford's—is thought of as well paid. Some time ago the *Survey* published an account of the yearly earnings of some of Ford's workmen, many of which ranged from $500 to $1,000 a year.

Sooner or later labor is going to demand that it be paid by the year as the salaried class is now paid. And it is going to back up its demand with effective legislation or organization, or both.

The argument for industrial unemployment reserves is simple. It has been excellently phrased by Louis D. Brandeis: "The right to regularity of employment is co-equal with the right to regularity in the payment of rent, in the payment of interest on bonds, in the delivery to customers of high quality goods contracted for. No business is successfully conducted which does not perform fully the obligations incident to each of these rights. Each of these obligations is equally a fixed charge. No dividend should be paid until each of these charges has been met. The reserve to insure regularity of employment is as imperative as the reserve for depreciation, and it is equally a part of the fixed charges to make the annual contribution to that reserve. No business is socially solvent without it."

The principle of reserves is one that is well recognized and widely practiced in business. Business has reserves for depreciation, reserves for depletion, reserves for obsolescence, reserves for taxes. More important still, business maintains reserves for interest and dividends. Even though capital in the form of machinery is idle, its owner receives his interest regularly. One hears no talk about this "dole" "undermining the character" of the American Capitalist. According to figures regularly compiled, the total recorded interest and dividend payments was greater in 1930 than in 1929, and only slightly less in the first six months of 1931 than in the same period in 1930. If industry is to assume the same obligation to the wage earner that it does to the investor—and there is every reason why it should—then there must be a new kind of reserve set up in industry, a reserve for unemployment.

What are the principal objections raised to the industrial reserves system? We are told that the best kind of unemployment insurance is jobs. There can be no dispute about that. The strongest case for the industrial reserves is that it will make more jobs. How?

In the first place, it will give the employer an incentive to stabilize his employment. I know there are employers who claim that it is impossible for them to stabilize their work. Yet, before the Senate committee on unemployment a few years ago, fully a dozen employers testified not only that they stabilized their own business to a large extent, but that they believed it could be done generally. Sam Lewisohn, among this number, testified that in his opinion at least half of the seasonal unemployment in the country could be eliminated. Instead of costing the employers of the country a large sum, Mr. Lewisohn calculated that it would mean a saving to American business of $2,000,000,000 a year.

In the second place, an unemployment reserves system would necessitate much better employment exchanges. People would be forced to take a very active interest in these now inert institutions. At present the employment office is merely a placement bureau and a labour exchange. If a state-wide unemployment reserve system were adopted, the exchange would assume a much larger function. It would direct the re-training of workmen whose skill is no longer demanded in industry. It would offer vocational guidance to such workmen. It would stimulate and cooperate with private employers, municipalities, and other agencies endeavoring to stabilize buiness and reduce unemployment. In short, the employment office would become the local agent of the Industrial Commission, and together they would be given the role of doing all a well-organized governmental agency can do to eliminate and mitigate unemployment.

Thirdly, the industrial reserves can be used to finance public works. This may seem like taking private property without due process of law. However, if an employer has no work for an individual, and under the law would have to pay him benefits, the employer, the employee, and the government—all three—would be ahead were the goverment to give him a job and the employer to pay him out of the reserve fund. That is exactly what is contemplated in the new legislation. There appears to be no excuse for giving a man a gratuitous benefit while the community has useful work for him to do. This is the mistake which has been made in England. Any one who looks about the community can observe all sorts of useful work that needs to be done and which might be done, if there were the money to pay for it. The industrial reserves idea is a way of bringing the men, the money, and the jobs together.

The principal objection which one encounters to each and all unemployment remedies is that they will place Wisconsin industry at a disadvantage in its competition with the industry of other states. I would not be the one to make light of this argument. It would be better, perhaps, if social legislation could all be enacted by the federal government. However, our constitutional precedents are such that this is not possible. The industrial competition argument is not a new one. It has been advanced when other social legislation has been proposed in this state. The policy of our state government has been to place upon industry the responsibilities to its employees and to the community that such industry might reasonably be expected to carry. In the long run, legislation which makes the community a better place in which to live has not proved bad for industry. This is demonstrated by the rapid rise of Wisconsin as an industrial state. It might also be observed that the employers of Rochester do not all expect to go bankrupt nor to move out of the State of New York. Neither need Wisconsin employers expect these catastrophies.

On the other hand, there is enough in the competition argument so that any state which loads off with legislation for unemployment reserves will necessarily have to be content with a moderate and conservative law. The first law which is passed will surely be a disappointment to those who expect the millenium by legislative flat to-morrow. If it is a sound step in the right direction, that is the important thing.

Can the industry of a particular state bear this additional burden? Industry cannot afford to take a narrow and short view of economy. The industrial future of any state depends to a large degree upon the quality of the people who man it. An institution which undermines the vigour and breaks the spirit of the people cannot be defended in the name of economy. Employers are the first to complain of the rising costs of government. A large part of the cost is due to the fact that we squander our human resources in industry. Crime, disease, insanity, immorality are all fed by unemployment. It is short-sighted economy to permit the huge wastes of unemployment to continue.

Will unemployment reserve discourage re-employment? Not to any great extent. Employers incur no liability in taking on additional men. The liability accumulates only as these men put in time. Unemployment reserves may put a brake upon the over-expansion of industry. They do mean that an employer will not take on and keep on men unless he feels that he can take some responsibility for them. There is no great advantage to a state in developing parasitic industries which rely on the taxpayer to come to their aid when the first clouds of depression begin to appear. (Loud Applause).

The President expressed the appreciation of the Club for the speaker's helpful suggestions.

MUSIC IN A DISORDERED WORLD

AN ADDRESS BY MR. EDWARD JOHNSON.

Thursday, December 29, 1932

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, President, introduced the speaker.

MR. JOHNSON: In the hustle of modern civilization—in the engrossing material battle for financial progress—the world today has forgotten, or perhaps mislaid, one of our most primitive and precious possessions—the art of experiencing pleasure through hearing. The pleasure I refer to, of course, is that implicit in music—an art which, since time immemorial, has swayed the emotions of humanity, but which, especially at this time, has an important bearing on our mind and spirit in a way few of us fully realize.

In Guelph, Ontario, we are endeavoring to place music in a much more intimate and closer association with normal everyday life. We are, as it were, putting music in the schools on a basis of arithmetic; in other words, as an essential in life. In this way, we believe, the children, on maturity, will have gained an asset in life that will not only bring them pleasure, but will influence culturally every channel of thought and reason.

Educators throughout the world are devising ways and means whereby they can stimulate the interest and enthusiasm of the youth of the country. In music and art, I firmly believe, lies an important key to unlock those treasures of elan and "urge" so vital to the higher fulfilment of youth's destiny.

It is remarkable that physical laws have boundless potentialities of which we have as yet scarcely touched the fringe. Witness all the marvels that have come into being during the past twenty years. The potentialities were always there—radio, television, radio telephony and aviation are but a few of the marvels that lay unsuspectedly within the grasp of humanity, ready for the vision, the word, the experiment, that would summon them to the service of man.

If this is so in the field of science, how much greater unplumbed depths lie in the human mind—the human intelligence? In this organization which we call the body, we have senses endowed by nature which we scarcely ever think about. We accept them as a matter of course. We get up; we walk; we run; we eat; we talk and listen. And all these actions, behind which are so many wonderful, intricate and delicately-balanced mechanisms and thought processes, we perform instinctively and unthinkingly. It is only when one of the parts become unmanageable that we really think of the body or mind at all. And while this matter-of-fact acceptance of our bodily and mental make-up is, in a way, natural, it has blinded us to much desirable knowledge.

In particular, there is one sense that is left very much in the background—the sense of hearing. Such is our modern condition that vision has been developed to a far greater extent than hearing. Children in the cinema houses are illustrative of this. It was noted in the days of the silent films that, long before the captions were flashed on the movie screen, every child knew what the film was about. The child, it was found, did not know enough to read what he saw. In many cases he couldn't read—but he could understand. Here is an illustration of the way in which we moderns have come to use the eye as a means of understanding, to the disadvantage of other senses.

When primitive man had to defend himself against the fang and claw of nature, his sense of hearing was more highly developed than his sense of vision. It had to be, because by the time he saw his enemy it would probably have been too late. And because of that actue hearing, he naturally had a keener, more active, pleasure in attractive sounds. Since in modern life we have so much that is beautiful, so much that can be appreciated only through hearing, it is evident that we are losing a great deal if we do not endeavor to re-acquire what we have lost of our capacity to hear. In our developing or recapturing this sense of hearing, it is my contention that there is no better medium than music.

Music is essentially the embodiment of rhythm. It began by rhythmic beating; then by swing; then by pitch; then by humming; and eventually by singing; then by tune and gradually through the centuries until we have the various instruments we know today.

But the voice was first—the voice was the essential; and it is the voice we must first approach. If we teach the children how to place the voice; how to gain from natural tests a knowledge of the qualities we know are there; how to get head resonance, expansion, inflection, diction, enunciation and quality; and if they carry this knowledge through life, is this not a splendid asset? Forgetting other aspects for a moment, business men will be the first to recognize how great this asset is when through it comes a man of personality, a man who has a sense of culture, a manner of speaking no one can take away from him.

Then there is culture—an attribute that is being valued more and more in life. If we teach the child culture, he will have a reserve that will be his to draw upon even in times of world depression. And, in writing of depression, I would like to say to the people of Canada that, although I visit the Dominion only occasionally, I know Canadians are putting up a great fight and I know they are going to win. I have abundant faith in Canada and the future that awaits her—and to bring that future nearer we must bring into our souls, into the minds of our boys and girls, that feeling not only for those material things which we have seen slip away, but for the greater and more valuable things of the spirit.

There is no greater way, perhaps, of accomplishing this than through the medium of art. Sometimes we think of art as "arty," but a fellow who is aesthetic—who thinks of and intensely appreciates beautiful things—is just as big a "he-man" as the fellow who glories simply in muscle. The way to create beautiful actions is to produce beautiful things, and the fellow at school today who acquires a love of the beautiful is making valuable and constructive mental progress.

In the realm of artistic things, one phase, of course, appeals to me because it is my life work, and that is music. And to me the finest quality of music is that it stirs the imagination—that in the rendering of a great symphony it is not the words we must hear to comprehend, but the beauty and message of the music. We have only to let our minds work before our emotions have full play. And, if we can teach this to children, if we can teach them to develop the quality of their imagination—to reach out beyond material things and bring beauty to themselves—that quality will remain with them through life.

Art, whether it is music, poetry or engineering, is necessarily creative. A man who makes a great business—who constructs a railroad—who makes a bridge—who does anything creative—has within him the seed of an artist. He must have, for to create demands imagination. And this is the quality which we want to instil into the young folk so that they will grow up and, in taking over charge of the country, will have the vision and imagination to carry it to a great goal.

A little digression may prove the value of some quality other than material in our lives. In the larger cities, more than the smaller cities, perhaps, a great fight is going on to keep up the spirit of the people. In New

York, for instance, every Tuesday afternoon at five o'clock, there is what they call a singing fest in the Town Hall. Some ladies raised enough money to take over the Hall, to get a Welshman who sings gospel songs, and a small orchestra. In addition, they have a screen and a lantern slide. At five o'clock the doors swing open and crowds pour in. Old songs of the gay nineties are sung as the words are flashed on the screen, and, as a novelty, they usually ask some celebrity to join in the song-fest. Some weeks ago they had genial Al Smith with them, and he sang "The Sidewalks of New York."

Two weeks ago in the Embassy at Washington, I dined with His Excellency the Minister, Mr. Herridge and his charming wife, and among the prominent people present was Hersham Meyers, Chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve Bank. Another Canadian guest asked Mr. Meyers for a statement he could take back to Canada. Mr. Meyers replied: "My dear friend, when things were at their very best, they never were as good as people thought they were; now they are at their worst, they are not as bad as people think they are."

My own experience bears this out. We have it in our theatre. The people who started the opera were, perhaps, those who were hurt the most. We have, for instance, men who have given millions to support good music and who today are unable to take boxes for the season. But they are game and they get their friends or associates to assume the burden. This spirit, which is based on things more intangible and more valuable ultimately than material considerations, is the spirit which must and will carry us through, and I feel confident that this year things will be adjusted in the theatre world. On our side, we have difficult moments, but we still have our souls in our work and try to keep up our spirits, believing that, when the financial situation is clear, people will again turn to the things in which we have faith. Everywhere the public is saying: "We'll see it through," and they are seeing it through. I believe, as my friends who conduct the songs at the New York Town Hall believe, that, in order to pep things up a little, we should say, "We'll sing it through."

One of the greatest English writers and poets said: "Mathematics is the science of Truth, and Art the science of Beauty." My belief is that art is beauty and beauty is art. I would go farther and say that art and religion are in the same sphere. They are each manifestations by which man endeavors to express his most shy and ethereal conceptions—his inward aspirations. They have to do with his emotions and they come from the spiritual, from the innermost depths of his soul. Just as religion is born of a religious feeling, so art is born of an artistic feeling. Art, in other words, is born of a feeling for beauty. Beauty must be found in life and then recreated into art.

And, of all the arts, none is so infused with this feeling as music; none is so simple as music; it has, indeed, been called the language of the universe, and its function in life is tremendous—as potent, almost, as speech itself. Music in some form is the outlet of a country's social and natural life. Great music is a tie that binds, a bond that brings us together, heart to heart, irrespective of birth, position, culture or ability.

Music humanizes and refines. Above all other arts, it is the true medium of expression through which pulse emotion and feeling—through which are reflected the ever-changing aspects of humanity: the joy of life, the tenderness of love, the poignancy of sorrow, the sword of pain—the whole gamut of human emotional experience. And, translated into music, human emotion assumes a dignity, reveals a hidden power, by which it rises from the personal to the universal, interpreting not only the individual, but the race. That is why music, in the arc of its flight, constitutes the only art wherewith to reveal the Infinite. (Loud applause.)

APPENDIX I

POSTPONEMENT OF ANNUAL MEETING

At the luncheon meeting held December 29, President Drew announced that the Executive Committee, after careful consideration, had concluded that certain proposed changes in the Club's constitution should be more thoroughly gone into, and for this purpose unanimously recommended a postponement of the annual meeting.

Mr. H. G. Stapells moved the following resolution:—

> "That notice of the Annual Meeting for 1932, pursuant to the constitution, be waived.
>
> "That the Annual Meeting of the Club be postponed until the last meeting in the Spring session of next year, due notice of which is to be given to all members."

Seconded by M. John D. Spence, K.C. CARRIED.

APPENDIX II.

ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Receipts and Payments for the Year ended 31st December, 1932.

RECEIPTS

Balance, 31st December, 1931		$ 5.60
Annual Fees Received:		
Resident	$3,767.00	
Non-Resident	75.00	
Junior	2.00	
		3,844.00
Interest on Bank Account		16.10
Proceeds from Sale of Year Book		6.00
Loan		500.00
Bank Overdraft 31st December, 1932		120.87
		$4,492.57

NOTE:

Accounts Payable as at 31st December, 1932 amount to	$ 224.40
Loan Payable amounts to	500.00

PAYMENTS

General Expenses:		
Salaries	$1,200.00	
Printing and Stationery	1,419.94	
Telegrams and Telephones	132.42	
Entertainment and Travelling Expenses	741.73	
Reporting	198.00	
Office Expense	549.75	
Miscellaneous	43.00	
		$4,284.84
Guests at Luncheons		207.73
		$4,492.57

We have audited the books and accounts of the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario for the year ended 31st December, 1932 and certify that in our opinion the above Statement of Receipts and Payments is correct according to the best of our information and the explanations given to us and as shown by the books of the Club for the year ended 31st December, 1932.

H. T. JAMIESON & COMPANY,
Chartered Accountants.
Honorary Auditors.

Toronto, Ontario.
28th January, 1933.

APPENDIX III.

HONORARY PRESIDENTS OF THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, 1903-1933.

1903-1912. Rt. Hon. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, G.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L.*

1913. Field Marshal H.R.H. The Duke of Connaught and Strathearn, K.G., G.C.M.G.

1931. His Excellency The Rt. Hon. Earl of Bessborough, P.C., G.C.M.G.

PAST PRESIDENTS:

1902-04.	Brig.-General James Mason.*
1904-05.	
1905-06.	Reverend William Clark, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.*
1906-07.	Mr. J. P. Murray.*
1907-08.	Mr. J. F. M. Stewart, B.A.
1908-09.	Mr. D. J. Goggin, M.A., D.C.L.
1909-10.	Mr. Elias Clouse, M.D.
1910-11.	Mr. J. Castell Hopkins, F.S.S.*
1911-12.	Mr. F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, K.C.
1912-13.	Right Reverend James F. Sweeney, M.A., D.D., D.C.L.
1913-14.	Mr. Justice James Craig.*
1914-15.	Lieut.-Colonel R. J. Stuart.
1915-16.	Mr. Albert Ham, Mus. Doc.
1916-17.	Mr. James Black Perry.
1917-18.	Mr. Norman Sommerville, M.A., K.C.
1918.	Mr. F. J. Coombs.
1919.	Mr. R. A. Stapells.
1920.	Mr. Arthur Hewitt.
1921.	Brig.-General C. H. Mitchell, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., LL.D.
1922.	Sir William Hearst, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
1923.	Mr. Ellis H. Wilkinson.
1924.	Mr. William Brooks.
1925.	Rev. Dr. R. N. Burns.
1926.	Colonel A. E. Kirkpatrick, Hon., A.D.C.
1927.	Colonel Alexander Fraser, LL.D., A.D.C.
1928.	Mr. Robert Fennell.
1929.	Mr. Hugh Eayrs.

1930.	Mr. John D. Spence.
1931.	Mr. H. G. Stapells.

HONORARY LIFE MEMBERS:

1920.	Colonel Alexander Fraser, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D.
1924.	Mr. D. J. Goggin, M.A. D.C.L.
1928.	Mr. H. G. Stapells.
1931.	His Excellency The Viscount Willingdon, G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G., Etc.

---

* Deceased.

CONSTITUTION

INSTITUTED 1903

THE OBJECT OF THE CLUB IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE INTERESTS OF CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

Organization of the Club and Branches

Art. 1.—(1) The organization shall be called the Empire Club of Canada.

(2) Branches of the Club may be established with the authority of the Executive Committee, and subject to such conditions and regulations as may from time to time be decided upon by the Club in Toronto.

(3) A committee may be appointed under the provisions of sub-section 2, article 1, for the establishment of branches of the Club, and the word "Unit" shall denote a Branch.

Classes of Members

Art. 2.—The Membership of the Club shall be open to any man of the full age of eighten years who is a British Subject and shall consist of

(a) Active Resident Members,
(b) Non-Resident Members,
(c) Life Members,
(d) Honorary Members.

Active Resident Members and Non-Resident Members

Art. 3.—(1) Candidates for Membership shall be proposed and seconded by two members of the Club in good standing, and shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee.

(2) Active Resident Members shall pay an annual fee of $4.00 and Non-Resident Members $3.00, this fee to include membership obtained after October 15th in any year till December 31st of the following year. Payment of such fee shall entitle each member to receive a copy of the Year Book. No member in arrears for fees or dues shall be considered in good standing or be eligible for office.

Life Members

Art. 4.—(1) Life Members, not exceeding ten in any one year, may be elected from time to time, at an open meeting of the Club, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Provided, however, that Ministers of the Federal Parliament and Premiers of the different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada may be eligible for election at any time, even though their election may cause the number of Life Members to exceed ten in one year.

(2) Life Members shall pay a fee of $50.00 in one sum.

Art. 5.—(1) Honorary Members may be elected upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and at a general meeting of the Club.

(2) Honorary Members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

Officers to be Elected

Art. 6.—(1) The officers of the Club shall consist of an Honorary President; a President; First, Second and Third Vice-Presidents; a Treasurer, a Secretary, or a Secretary-Treasurer; and seventeen other members, all of whom shall be elected by ballot. These members together with the officers before mentioned, shall constitute the Executive Committee, and shall hold office throughout the calendar year. All Past Presidents shall constitute an Advisory Council under the Chairmanship of the immediate Past President and such Advisory Council shall elect annually three members, who, together with the retiring President, shall be the ex-officio members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

Election of Officers

(2) The Election of Officers of the Club shall take place at a general meeting of the members, to be held not later than December 15th of each year, at a date to be decided upon by the Executive Committee, and this meeting shall be deemed to be the Annual Meeting. A committee to nominate the officers for the new year shall be appointed at the meeting next preceding such Annual Meeting, due notice of such meeting to be given to all members in good standing, and such committee shall report to the Annual Meeting; provided that no member shall be nominated to any office unless and until he has given notice in writing that he consents to such nomination and will act if elected to the position for which he has been nominated.

(3) Two Auditors shall be elected at each Annual Meeting.

Standing Committees

(4) Standing Committees shall be appointed as follows:—

(*a*) Finance Committee.
(*b*) Speakers' Committee.
(*c*) Membership Committee.
(*d*) Constitution Committee.
(*e*) Luncheon and Reception Committee.
(*f*) Publicity Committee.
(*g*) Royal Colonial Institute Committee.

Filling of Vacancies Among Officers

Art. 7.—In the event of an office becoming vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thus caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee and the person so chosen shall hold office until the next Annual Meeting.

Duties of Officers

Art. 8.—The duties of the officers shall be those customary to such positions in similar organizations.

Holding of Meetings

Art. 9.—(1) The Club shall hold general meetings weekly from October to May, both inclusive, in each twelve months with such intermissions as from time to time may be decided upon.

(2) At the Annual Meeting a report of the year's proceedings and work shall be submitted by the President, and this report shall be accompanied by an interim report from the Treasurer. As the financial year does not end until December 31st, the Treasurer shall, in addition to the interim report presented at the Annual Meeting, present an audited statement of the finances of the Club for the full financial year at regular meeting of the Club held during the month of January.

Notice of Meetings

Art. 10.—Written or printed notices of all meetings shall be given to the members of the Club. Such notices shall be sufficient if addressed to the members, and deposited post paid in the post office in Toronto.

Quorum at Meetings

Art. 11.—Fifteen members in good standing shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Club, general, annual or special and the presiding officer shall have a casting vote. Six members shall form a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Limitation of Business at General Meetings

Art. 12.—No business other than the hearing of the addresses and notices of motion shall be introduced at any meeting of the Club, unless it has been submitted to the Executive Committee and received its approval.

Calling of Special Meetings

Art. 13.—Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be called by the President, or on a requisition signed by three of its members. Special meetings of the Club may be called by the President, and shall be called by him on a requisition signed by twelve members and stating the object of the meeting. This object shall be stated in the notice calling the special meeting.

Financial Year

Art. 14.—The Financial Year shall be the same as the calendar year, *viz.*: January first to December thirty-first.

Amendments to Constitution

Art. 15.—This Constitution may be amended at the Annual Meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, subject to a two-thirds majority vote of the members present.